NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW

NO. DCLXXXVIII

MARCH, 1913

JEFFERSON—WILSON

A RECORD AND A FORECAST

EXTRACTS FROM "A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE" BY

WOODROW WILSON

CLEARLY the Federalists had gone too far. The indictment of their enemies seemed proved,—they were the party of power, of autocratic power, and not the party of popular privilege. While the bad impression was at its height, moreover, a serious rift was disclosed in the counsels of the party itself. Mr. Adams broke with Mr. Hamilton. . . .

And Adams spoke the real preferences of the rank and file of the Federalist party itself,—the very party which, until that day of breach, Mr. Hamilton had led with an almost undisputed supremacy. It had doubted and been vaguely uneasy even while it obeyed. . . .

Mr. Adams was much nearer their spirit and temper than Mr. Hamilton and the group of masterful men whom he led; and his breach with Mr. Hamilton cut to the roots of the party itself. By the time another presidential election approached (1800) personal rivalries and antagonisms had robbed the party of coherence and leadership;

Copyright, 1913, by THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW PUBLISHING COMPANY. All Rights Reserved.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

it had lost its sense of unity; many who had voted with it felt their sympathies transferred to the other side; and the elections brought it humiliating defeat. Mr. Adams was personally popular enough, commended by his sturdy character, his manifest good faith and independence, his frankness and courage; but the section of his own party with which he had avowed himself out of sympathy was not loyal to him. Hamilton publicly argued that he was unfit for the office he held, egotistical, jealous, indiscreet, and of unsound views in matters of administration; Mr. Jefferson had at last imparted compactness and self-reliant vigor to the Democratic Republican ranks which he led; and Mr. Adams failed of re-election. . . .

The whole face of affairs, the very aspect of the government itself, seemed to change when Mr. Jefferson became President. For one thing, the seat of government was transferred from Philadelphia, the busy city and mart of trade, with its seventy thousand inhabitants, to the rural spaces of the new federal District of Columbia. The removal had been effected in the summer of 1800, during the closing months of Mr. Adams's administration, and had suitably marked the *exeunt* of the Federalists, the party whose rule had been planned to draw about the federal government the support of the merchants, the bankers, the property-owners, the chief men of means and influence in society and affairs, the men of the centers of trade, whose interests were larger than those of any single State or neighborhood. . . .

A noteworthy and momentous thing stood revealed in the simple ceremony. The democratic forces which had set the Revolution ablaze, and which had operated through seven years of war and reconstruction to work a radical change in the temper and practice of the whole country in public affairs, now once again reasserted themselves and took possession of the seats of government. . . .

Nothing could exceed the fine tact and gentleness with which Mr. Jefferson gave tone of order and patriotic purpose in his inaugural address to the new way of government his followers expected of him. "We are all Re-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

publicans, we are all Federalists," he exclaimed; "we are not antagonists, but live by an absolute acquiescence in the decisions of the majority, the vital principle of republics." "To preserve the peace of our fellow-citizens, promote their prosperity and happiness, reunite opinion, cultivate a spirit of candor, moderation, charity, and forbearance towards one another," are "objects calling for the efforts and sacrifices of every good man and patriot." "Let us unite with one mind," he urged, in tones so quiet, so sweet and sincere of accent as to calm every mind they touched; "let us restore to social intercourse that harmony and affection without which liberty and even life itself are but dreary things. And let us reflect that having banished from our land that religious intolerance under which mankind so long bled and suffered, we have yet gained little if we countenance a political intolerance as despotic, as wicked, and capable of as bitter and bloody persecutions."

And what he did soon gave excellent proof of his sincerity. Mr. Jefferson was an interesting mixture of democrat, philosopher, and patrician. In taste and occupation and habit he touched and was familiar with the life of the cultured and moneyed classes, the aristocracy of the young nation, which constituted the Federalist strength. In creed and principle he was the comrade and work-fellow of the people. By gift of insight and genius for organization he was a leader of parties and of concerted action in affairs. An infinite sensibility taught him moderation, lent him tact, pointed out to him the practicable courses of persuasion and the certain prospects of popular support. His personal charm, his high breeding without arrogance or pretense, gave him hold upon every one with whom he came in contact. No other man could have so moderated, or so completed, a revolution in the spirit and conduct of the government.

For a revolution it was, profound and lasting. Undoubtedly the chief merchants, the chief men of parts and learning and social influence in the country were Federalists. They looked upon Mr. Jefferson as "an atheist in religion and a fanatic in politics"; and they dreaded the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

direct thrusts of democracy at the careful system they had reared, as likely to be little less than the throwing down of the very props of society itself. . . .

Mr. Jefferson's was an opposite school of thought. "I am persuaded," he said, "that the good sense of the people will always be found the best army. They may be led astray for the moment, but will soon correct themselves." His belief was wholly sincere, aristocrat though he was in life and breeding and in instinctive aptitude for power; and it was wholesome for the country that the forces he so moderately and graciously represented should thus early gain their inevitable ascendency. It was impossible that the ruling classes of the older days should continue to govern the young nation now springing into life. Mere growth and change of life had broken every bond of habit and restraint of form. . . .

No class or region or single school of politicians or thinkers could keep the mastery or determine the course of such a people, growing after such a fashion, on such a continent. Democracy, free force, an equal footing for all men in opinion, effort, and attainment were the very conditions of its being; there could be no leading-strings. Mr. Jefferson spoke the spirit of the day, its only acceptable principle in affairs. The government had passed into the hands of the people's party.

Its programme, as Mr. Jefferson spoke it, accorded with its origin: The restriction of federal powers within strait constitutional limits, an unembarrassed field for the powers of local self-government within the several States, the payment of the public debt, the reduction of the armed forces of the country, and consequently of the taxes, to the lowest practicable point, and as nearly as might be free trade at the ports; a government simple, inexpensive, unmeddlesome. Some of the latest and most partisan acts of the Federalists the new Congress, with its working majority of Republicans, proceeded to undo. The Judiciary Act, by which the Federalists had called new federal courts into existence to fill them with judges of their own party principles, was repealed, and the new courts were

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

abolished almost before they had been organized. The other officials whom Mr. Adams had put into office during the closing days of his term were dismissed, and Republicans were put in their places. . . .

The new Congress reduced the federal taxes, and the customs duties at the ports; cut down the army and navy establishments; retrenched expenses and lessened burdens, as had been promised and expected; but the despondent forebodings of those Federalists who had looked to see a fatal retrogression in the character of the government were not fulfilled. The people's men were not, after all, "Jacobins and miscreants," and Mr. Cabot was apparently not yet justified in considering "democracy to be the government of the worst." Mr. Jefferson called Mr. Madison to the Secretaryship of State, a man whom all the country knew to be a patriot and a statesman. He made Albert Gallatin, of Pennsylvania, Secretary of the Treasury, and financiers soon learned to trust the clear-headed Swiss for judgment and capacity almost as much as they had trusted Mr. Hamilton himself. There was, at any rate, no revolution in the business methods of the government. . . .

Mr. Jefferson was too wise a politician to alienate the very men whose suffrages had brought him into office. He knew that many thoughtful men who had before always voted with the Federalists had in the last election voted for the Democratic Republican electors,—not because ready to see the government experimented with, but because they hated the taxes with which the Federalist Congresses loaded them, disliked the new tone and temper of the Federalist leaders, and believed that, for all they were so radical in their talk, the leaders of the opposition would simplify the government without weakening it or doing it damage. He knew that he was on trial to prove his conservatism as well as to prove his capacity for reform. He meant to prove himself no enemy of an efficient federal government, but only an enemy of extremes. . . .

It turned out that he had judged the temper of the country and the posture of affairs to a nicety, and had brought

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in a new regime which was to give its opponents abundant time to assess its qualities. Mr. Jefferson remained eight years in office; and handed on the presidency to men of his own school of political principle, who kept it for sixteen years more. . . .

Mr. Jefferson had given the country its first taste of his real quality in action. He was a Democrat, a people's man, upon conviction, genuinely and with a certain touch of passion; but he was no lawyer. He stickled for a strict construction of the constitution only when he thought that a strict construction would safeguard the rights of common men and keep the old Federalist theories of government at arm's-length: not because he disliked to see the country have power as a nation, but because he dreaded to see it put in bondage to an autocratic government. He wanted as little governing from the federal capital as might be; but as much progress as might be, too, and as much access of power and of opportunity to the people as a body of free men, unshackled by any too meddling government. It was his weakness to think it safe for the friends of the people to make "a blank paper" of the constitution, but the very gate of revolution for those who were not Democrats. If only Democrats led, "the good sense of the country would correct the evil of construction when it should produce ill effects"! . . .

The Federalist leaders found, moreover, that their own partisans, upon whom they had thought that they could reckon, gave them no countenance. It was impossible to arouse or alarm them. Mr. Jefferson had proved no monster, after all, but an amiable and attractive gentleman, graceful in conciliation, and apparently honest in his desire to serve the whole country, spite of what was said against him.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PUBLIC OWNERSHIP IN FRANCE

BY PAUL LEROY-BEAULIEU, PROFESSOR OF POLITICAL ECONOMY AT LE COLLÈGE DE FRANCE

THE question of Public Ownership, called in France the *étatisation* or the *municipalisation* of Public Utilities, has been to the fore in that country for the past quarter of a century. The Government, Parliament, and public opinion have been continually examining the subject, and in recent years interesting experiments have been made in this field.

In France, for more than a century, the State has had the monopoly of certain great industries. This monopoly was constituted either for fiscal reasons, in order to bring large sums of money into the public treasury, or for reasons of public safety, in order to strengthen the military position of the country. In this connection I will not take up the Post Office, which, under the ancient régime, was farmed to a company of financiers and which, since the end of the eighteenth century, has also been a Government monopoly—the system now adopted in most countries. To the Post Office was, later, united the telegraph, and, some twenty-five years ago, the telephone also. In addition to these, the French State also enjoys two other important fiscal monopolies—the manufacture and sale of tobacco and matches.

The first of these two monopolies, tobacco, is more than a century old, having been taken over by the State at the very beginning of the nineteenth century. In accordance with its stipulations French agriculturalists may not raise tobacco except in certain special cases and then in a very small number of departments. Furthermore, they must be provided with a Government permit, and the cultivation is supervised by the agents of the fisc, who enumerate the plants, count the leaves, and then buy the crop at a price fixed by the Government. The tobacco, whether raised in France or bought abroad, is manufactured in a limited number of factories owned by the State, whence it is sent to depots under Government directors, where it is finally dis-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tributed among the retail dealers, some 30,000 in number for the territory of France, who are appointed by the Government and who sell the different qualities of tobacco at prices authorized by the Government. As these prices are very high, the monopoly turns in a large sum to the national treasury. The gross receipts reach in round numbers 500,000,000 francs, netting 400,000,000, the total expenses being only about one-fifth of the sale price. The French people are now accustomed to this monopoly—in operation for over a hundred years—having been established in France at a moment when the consumption of tobacco was very small and the production still smaller, for nearly all the tobacco was imported. The enormous fiscal advantages derived from this monopoly also tend to render it less unpopular, though complaints are common concerning the bad quality of French Government tobacco, and because the retail dealers have not always in stock the exact kind of tobacco wanted by the purchaser, who, knowing that he will have to wait several days to get what he asks for, accepts what is offered. A graver inconvenience came out in 1910 and 1911. In addition to the monopoly of tobacco, the Government is also the only producer of nicotine. Now it so happens that nicotine is very efficacious in destroying insects harmful to certain plants and fruits. During the two years just mentioned, the Mediterranean portion of the French vineyards was attacked by a species of scale insect which would penetrate into the grape and devour all the juice. So the viticulturalists suddenly needed a large quantity of nicotine with which to fight this insect. But on account of the routine and lack of suppleness which always characterizes Government enterprises, the required amount of nicotine could not be furnished. The result was that the grape crop was very short and the viticulturalists lost several tens of millions of francs.

The Government match monopoly is less important. It has existed for only some thirty years and brings into the State Treasury about 40,000,000 francs gross, or about 30,000,000 net, the sale price being about quadruple the cost price. Every Frenchman and every foreigner visiting France knows the exceedingly bad quality of the French Government match. Sometimes you have to strike a half-dozen before one will light. In 1910 the Government tried to stop the making and the sale of vest-pocket tinder-boxes,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

even taking legal proceedings against those who sold them or used them. The pressure of public opinion, however, stopped this, and the Government had to content itself with putting a high duty on them. Before the match industry became a monopoly several millions' worth of French matches were exported annually; but the business is now completely dead. The same thing is true of the tobacco industry; though the Government sells 500,000,000 francs' worth of tobacco to its own citizens, its export trade is next to nothing.

Powder for the army and navy, as well as for mining and sport, is another Government monopoly in France. The aim in this case is not financial; but a pretended military and national interest was given out as the reason for this monopoly when it was established at the beginning of the nineteenth century. The system has always been a cause of much complaint from the mining interests and sportsmen. Leaving the army and navy out of the account, the Government sells the French public from twenty-two to twenty-three millions' worth of powder a year. The terrible disasters in the French navy—when the ironclad *Jena* was blown up, and but a few years later the *Liberté*—are attributed by a deeply moved public to the bad quality of the powder in the ships' magazines. An official investigation has revealed the most crying abuses and the greatest negligence in the management of some of the Government powder depots. In fact, the pressure of public opinion has led the Cabinet and Parliament to examine the question of what restrictions can be placed on the Government manufacture of powder, and has brought about the authorization, under certain conditions, of the manufacture and sale of powder through private enterprise.

Though the French State has not made a monopoly of the building of war-ships and the furnishing of all the necessary supplies, still a large part of this work is done in the Government yards, which give permanent work to some 30,000 men. In 1908 Senator Poirier, of the Finance Committee of the Upper House, made a report on the working of these State arsenals.* These potent facts concerning

* In my volume *Collectivisme*, fifth edition, pages 673 to 685, I have examined this report in detail; but suffice it to give here one single sentence, a résumé of the whole: "In the military posts and arsenals the waste of the public funds is simply beyond imagination."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the French State industries have often been pointed out to Parliament, and especially to the Senate, by M. Antonin Dubost, now President of that distinguished body.

It is not superfluous to say here a few words about one of the most recent French State monopolies—the telephone. The complaints under this head are universal. In the first place, the tariff is very high—400 francs, or nearly $80 a year in Paris, the aim of the State being to get out of it as much as possible—40,000,000 francs gross. But this is not the only thing to criticize. The apparatus is antiquated and the employees incapable. As a rule, it takes many minutes to get a communication in Paris, and when you would converse with other cities, even when they are not far apart, the best plan is not to try.

As regards wireless telegraphy, the subject may be dismissed in very few words: it is *going to be* a State monopoly too, and so the French public does not yet enjoy the benefit of this new discovery.

Another and very striking example of the mediocre ability of the State in industrial matters is furnished by the Public Printing Office. This institution came under Government control before the Revolution of 1789 and at first was devoted exclusively to the printing of works in the Oriental languages for which private concerns had neither the type nor the knowledge, so there was ground for such a plant. But little by little during the nineteenth century the functions of the National Printing Office were extended until it became transformed into an ordinary printing establishment doing all sorts of work, and doing it in such a wasteful manner that the whole subject has been brought before Parliament. The height of the scandal was reached when it was decided to reconstruct a part of the building of the Printing Office, this work to cost, according to the original estimates, 2,700,000 francs. At the end of 1910, however, it was found that 12,000,000 had already been spent and 5,300,000 more would be required to complete the work, making a total of 17,300,000 instead of 2,700,000 as originally called for. That is to say, the work was going to cost more than six times what had been stated in the estimates. So an official investigation into the whole general management of the Public Printing Office was set on foot, when it was found that for the 1,300 printers employed, there were 172 officials and superintendents of one kind and another—

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that is, one for every eight workmen. Among these officials, 135 belonged to the director's department alone, one for less than every ten workmen, whereas in a private establishment of the same importance there would be one for every thirty-four workmen—that is, four times less.*

If we take up the State railway system of France we find all these shortcomings on a still larger scale. Prior to 1875, there were no railways of this kind in France. The plan generally adopted in France has been a concession to a private company for a period of ninety-nine years. For some of these companies a little more than half of the concession has now expired, and for others nearly one-half. At the end of this period of ninety-nine years—that is, between 1950 and 1960 for the principal companies—the railways will revert to the State, which does not mean, however, that the State will have to take over their management. The State can then make a new concession on more advantageous terms for it and for the public, because if not all, at least the largest part of the capital used for the building of the roads will have been liquidated by the redemption, which the companies make every year, of a part of their shares and bonds. In France the State originally aided in the building of its railway system by moderate money subventions and by guaranteeing the payment of the interest on the capital used for the building of the secondary lines. The development of traffic and of net profits has generally made it unnecessary for the companies to have recourse to this plan of guaranteed interest, and the principal companies have already paid back, or will eventually be able to pay back, the sums advanced by the State for this purpose.

Thus, in the original plan of the French railway system the State took no part in the management. About the year 1875, circumstances threw into its hands a line which at first was not of very great importance; some small companies in the western part of France, between Bordeaux and Nantes, failed or got into financial difficulties, and the State, in order to preserve the shareholders from complete ruin, did what was not at all necessary—bought up the line belonging to these small companies, and instead of passing it on to a large and flourishing company decided to manage the line,

* *Journal Officiel,* November 25, 1910; *Journal des Débats,* November 26, 1910.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

at least provisionally. But this temporary arrangement finally became a permanent one, and gradually the line was lengthened until it reached Paris, so that there came to be in western France a line linking the capital with Bordeaux and Nantes. This line, known as "the old State railway," is now about 3,000 kilometers in length, thus forming about a sixteenth part of the total length of the whole French railway system. The running of this road is very expensive. Its net revenues do not represent two per cent. on the invested capital. It has had some terrible accidents of late, costing the lives of scores of passengers. The last one was due to the bad condition of a bridge over the Loire; the weakness of this bridge had been common report for a long time.

In 1908 the State added to its small system a much larger network of railways by taking over the important Western Company, which controlled the roads of Brittany, Normandy, and some neighboring departments, and which, starting at Paris, had as termini the seaports of Havre, Cherbough, Brest, and Nantes. This system embraces about 6,000 kilometers and brings up the total of the State roads to 9,000 kilometers, or nearly a fifth of the whole French system of railways.

For a long time the Radical party, which has been in power in France from 1898 to 1911, inclusive, has favored the policy of taking over the railways and having them managed by the State. This was one of the planks of the Radical platform as far back as 1889. The Conservative party, on the contrary, has always opposed this idea. The Ministers of Finance of the Third Republic, who have left the best names—M. Léon Say and M. Maurice Rouvier—always combated the proposal, whose financial and economic consequences they held would prove to be most disastrous. In 1908 the Clémenceau Cabinet, in which M. Caillaux was Minister of Finance and M. Barthou, Minister of Public Works, took over the management of the Western Company in the name of the State, notwithstanding the almost unanimous disapproval of the measure by the representatives of the region directly affected and the protests of nearly all of the French Chambers of Commerce. The bill was carried through the Chamber of Deputies without much trouble, but in the Senate it required a threat of a Cabinet crisis to obtain the small majority finally secured;

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and during the debate these ministers just mentioned repeatedly assured the recalcitrant senators that the transaction would cost the French Treasury nothing, that it would be an *opération blanche*, as the net receipts of the lines would cover the indemnity which had to be paid the company. Now, the State began its management in January, 1909—that is, four years ago, long enough for us to draw some conclusions. And what is the result?

The State management of the Western Railway has been from the very start, and continues to be, a great financial and technical disappointment. For the first two years the whole line was in absolutely chaotic condition. The trains were never on time and the worst possible accidents were continually happening, whereas under the old management not a single passenger had been killed in ten years. After many experiments, the new management was forced to reduce the number of trains and cut down the speed of the principal ones. To-day the technical side is better than it was at first, but not better than it was under the old company. The financial results, however, could not be much worse than they are, and are a great load on the State Treasury.

In the year 1908, the one preceding the operation of the road by the State, the old Western Company had a net deficit of 27,000,000 francs, and consequently, in accordance with the plan then in force, the company borrowed from the State this sum with which to pay the interest on its bonds and shares. In 1909, the first year that the State had control of the roads, this deficit rose to 38,500,000 francs, and continued to rise as follows during the succeeding years: 1910, 58,500,000; 1911, 71,250,000; 1912, estimated, 84,500,000; and 1913, estimated, 90,000,000 in round numbers. While I am writing these lines M. Chéron, Deputy and a former Assistant Secretary, publishes a report on the subject in the name of the Budget Committee of the Chamber of Deputies. He belongs to the Radical party, but has to admit that the figures of the estimated deficit for the year 1913 are "very disquieting," and adds that the estimated deficit for 1912, as well as that for 1913, is largely attributable to salaries of the employees, the increase under this head being 52,000,000 francs since the State took over the road. M. Chéron declares that he is "not accusing anybody," doubtless because he knows it would do no good. He says he might be

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

willing to accept an increase in salaries and wages, but points out that there is an excessive augmentation in the number of employees. Here are his exact words on this point: "As regards the increase of the personnel, it seems to me the administration has been rather large. But the same thing is true of all the departments." And then he concludes with these words: "In this matter of the augmentation of the personnel, I understand it has reached the maximum." This reflection of an out-and-out Radical Deputy is very characteristic. In the Government offices, at least in France, there is always a tendency to over-increase the number of the employed. But in this way more citizens are made happy, and the party in power fares better at the elections.

Thus, as we have seen, the trial of State ownership in France is directly against that system, and consequently public opinion is now completely opposed thereto, especially enlightened, as it now is, by the financial and other shortcomings which have followed the State operation of the Western Railway. It may be regarded as certain that, notwithstanding the seventy Socialist Deputies in the Chamber, it will be a good many years before another French Minister of Finance will venture to propose the State taking over another railway.

The municipalization of city public utilities, such as street-lighting, motive power, tramways, etc., has not gone far in France, though it has many supporters not only among our Socialists, but also among our Radicals. As most of the concessions for gas, electricity, water, and the street-passenger traffic expired in the early years of the twentieth century, it might have been thought for a moment that the Paris Municipal Council would have municipalized these different services. But nothing came of the very artificial movement in that direction set on foot by the Radical Socialist party. On the contrary, the Paris Municipal Council has, during the last fifteen years, made new concessions to private companies in different forms and for varying terms of years in the matter of all the services just mentioned. This is a notable fact, for it was done though municipalization was advocated by a large and influential group in the Council.

The concession which had been enjoyed for three-quarters of a century by the Paris Gas Company expired in 1905.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But the Paris Municipal Council declined to assume the responsibility of directing that industry. It preferred the system by which it became simply "an interested party"—that is, the gas-works belong to the municipality, but the making of the gas is done by a company which furnishes the working capital and which shares the profits with the city. In accordance with this arrangement, the city may end the concession every five years by giving the company two years' notice; that is to say, the city is bound for seven years. The first period of five years expired in 1910, without the city making use of this right, so that the present arrangement will last at least until 1915; and everything points to its continuing even longer, especially as the Municipal Council elected in 1912 for four years is friendly to the present arrangement. In fact, at the moment of writing, the city of Paris is negotiating a loan of 200,000,000 francs with which to enlarge its present gas-works and even to build new ones to be run under the present concession.

A similar arrangement—that of "an interested administration"—exists with the General Water Company, and in 1910 the city renewed this arrangement for a very long period.

Some thirty years ago concessions, beginning with a period running from 1882 to 1889, were granted to a half-dozen companies, each being given a fraction of the city, called a *secteur*. These concessions had to do with electricity, heating, lighting, and motive power, and all will expire in 1914. Five or six years ago the Paris Municipal Council united all the *secteurs* and conceded the city's electricity and motive power for a period of twenty-six years—that is, from 1914 to June 30, 1940—to a large financial group called the Paris Company for Electrical Distribution. In the matter of electric lighting and heating, this company has a monopoly; but as regards electric motive power the Municipal Council reserves the right to permit other companies to furnish electric power to the city. Within the last few months a grant of this kind has come up for consideration, so that in this matter of electric power it is highly probable that the city of Paris will adopt a competitive system.

In the matter of urban passenger traffic, the municipality has had recourse also to the concessionary system under different forms and conditions. There are in Paris two distinct subway companies, the older and more important

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

being the Metropolitan, whose concession is for forty years after the opening of the last portion of the road. The city assumes all the cost of tunneling, the company making the road-bed, building the stations, furnishing the rolling-stock, and running the road. It gives the city one-third of the gross receipts and a certain portion of the increased traffic when it surpasses a fixed figure. The second subway company, the North-South, has made a different arrangement with the city. The company does all the work of construction, the city simply approving and supervising the plans and their execution and sharing in the profits, this share being based on the number of passengers carried. This concession is for seventy-five years.

And lastly, the city renewed three or four years ago for periods of about fifty years, with large shares in the profits, its concessions to all the tramway, omnibus, and auto-bus companies.

Thus, from 1900 to 1910, inclusive, the Paris Municipal Council has been handing over to private companies under varying conditions for periods extending to 1943 and even to 1980, all the urban public utilities—electricity, water, and passenger traffic, as well as gas, on a somewhat different plan as explained above.

This system of concessions to private companies, producing a considerable reduction in the prices paid formerly by the public for its utilities and offering the city considerable participation in the profits, is now both favorably received by Parisians and very advantageous to the city treasury. In the case of long concessions, the municipality has reserved the right, on certain conditions, to take over the utility at the end of a fixed time, generally after a lapse of ten or fifteen years. But in the present state of mind of the municipality and Paris public opinion, it is not probable that the city will exercise this power. The public especially approves of the plan by which the city participates in the profits derived from the concessions. At the recent municipal election in May, 1912, the question of the municipalization of public utilities or of the city exercising its reserved right of taking over any of them was not brought up at all, and almost every one of the candidates for re-election who favored this system was successful at the polls. If one or two of these were defeated, it was due to quite other and personal reasons.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

As I have already said, this system is very beneficial to the Paris treasury. For instance, during the year 1910 it brought in 83,000,000 francs, of which 34 to 35 millions were from gas, 27 to 28 from water, 18 from the subway, and the rest from electricity. The last item is sure to increase rapidly and considerably. It is true that these 83,000,000 francs must meet the interest on large loans which the city was forced to have recourse to in order to carry through some of these enterprises. But it is safe to say that interest and amortizement do not represent more than one-half of the sums which the city receives from these sources; and these sums are sure to increase gradually and notably. I estimate that, toward the middle of the present century, 150 or perhaps even 200 million francs will be the minimum sum which the city will derive from these urban utilities under the present arrangement, of which sum at least one-half, if not three-fifths or two-thirds, will be net profit.

In this matter of urban utilities, most of the cities of France have copied Paris more or less closely. The exceptions are those towns where the municipal council is Socialist or Collectivist; in which cases some of the utilities, especially that of lighting, have been municipalized. But these are rare exceptions in France, and the experiment has not, as a rule, been a success. The city of Elbeuf, for example, offers almost a tragic case. A few years ago the municipal council and the mayor decided to municipalize the gas, and announced their intention to extend this plan to various other industries. But their initial step proved most disastrous, and the municipal gas company was run at a marked loss to the city treasury. The mayor, who represented his town in the Chamber of Deputies, was so affected by the situation and the unpopularity in which he fell, that he actually committed suicide. His death was followed by a new election, when the victorious municipal council immediately leased the city gas interests to a private company.

As a result of all this, municipalization is not in good odor just now in France. A very striking proof of this has recently been furnished. In consequence of the wide-spread complaints over the increased cost of living, the Caillaux Cabinet brought in a bill authorizing the Paris municipality to establish butcher-shops and bakeries. But public opinion was so opposed to this project that the Poincaré Cabinet,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which succeeded the Caillaux Cabinet, promptly withdrew this bill.

It is true that the city of Paris has decided in principle to call for a loan of 200,000,000 francs for constructing or aiding by loans, the construction of cheap working-men's homes; and that the Government has introduced a bill to enable French towns in general to do this same thing. But the bill provides that the towns must, as a rule, come to an arrangement with some co-operative or ordinary stock company to whom will be loaned, at a low interest, the funds necessary to build these houses. So the general idea of the bill is that the municipalities will neither construct nor manage these houses. Even the Minister of Labor, M. Léon Bourgeois, who belongs to the advanced Democratic party, has concurred publicly in this view.

I repeat, therefore, that State ownership and operation of public utilities, that municipalization, that the participation of the departments or public authorities of any kind is in disgrace in France, the final blow to the system having been given by the lamentable failure, still in progress, of the Western Railway management. And I may add that a careful study of the nature and working of the modern State and public bodies to-day, especially in wholly democratic countries, shows that reasons of the highest theoretical gravity add their weight to those of a practical kind in favor of the rejection of the idea of State operation of public utilities of any sort. But my contradictors may point to Germany, and especially to Prussia, as a proof that the State can operate creditably great railway systems. My reply is that Germany and Prussia are in no respects democratic countries; that Prussia is not even a Parliamentary one, subject to electoral servitude and to the instability of elective administrations. The Prussian bureaucracy is very strongly organized, quite independent of Parliament, an autonomous body in no way influenced by the sudden changes of the outside world. Furthermore, we must take into account the German character, and particularly the Prussian character, full of discipline and deeply imbued with the military spirit and functionary pedantism. In other countries, where these conditions do not exist, State railways are far from being above criticism. In Belgium, for instance, which is, however, a very industrial and prosperous, as well as a very calm and sensible nation, the State

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

operation of the railways has given rise in Parliament to very severe and well-founded criticisms. In this connection I need simply call attention to the recent Parliamentary report of M. Hubert, who has been several times Minister. So strong is the blame in this document that it places the operation of the Belgian roads very much below that of private companies, and especially below that of the French Northern Company, which operates a system similar to those of Belgium. M. Hubert even goes so far as to suggest that it might be advantageous to lease the Belgian roads to one or more companies. Political reasons oppose such a radical change as that, but the mere fact of its being proposed condemns the State management of the Belgian railway system.*

The weakness of State administration in such matters springs from the very nature of our modern contemporary governmental forms. As a general thing, State functionaries advance by age, and even when promotion comes through special choice the fortunate officeholder owes his success largely to the fact that he has served faithfully for many years. It is safe to say that almost never does a State functionary get to the top before he is 50 or 55, often even 60, years old. In big private concerns, on the contrary, you often find important posts filled by men between 35 and 42 or 43 years of age, which is a great advantage to these companies, for energy, decision, and initiative are generally dulled toward 60, and especially so beyond that year. Again, the State officeholder is governed by very narrow rules from which he cannot escape; he has no initiative and is subject to a jealous control. Then there is State accounting, often very niggling; credits parsimoniously accorded which cannot be promptly increased, however necessary and however much such an increase would be to the public good. A State functionary is always hampered, and when the unexpected happens his position is not to be envied. There is much more red tape in State accounts than in those of private companies, with the result that every State enterprise is weighed down by routineism. Another cause of the inferiority of State functionaries arises from their not being able to share in the pecuniary success of the business which they direct. Their salary, which is

* I go into this report in detail in the fourth edition of my book *L'État Moderne et ses Fonctions,* pages 258 to 268. Paris: *Librairie; Félix Alcan.*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

always very modest, remains stationary, whatever the profits of the business may be. A salary of from 25,000 to 35,000 francs is considered very high in the French official world. In a recent Parliamentary report the idea was put forward that no officeholder should be paid more than a deputy or senator—that is, 15,000 francs a year. But in big private concerns the managers come in for a large share in the profits. I know cases where engineers from 35 to 45 years old, and directors of insurances companies, receive regularly from 120,000 to 200,000 francs annually. Small salaries tend to produce inertness in those who receive them, while salaries that grow with the progress of the business have the contrary effect.

But this does not close the list of circumstances which oppose the operation of public utilities by the State or municipalities. In our modern democratic countries the Government and public men are beset by election considerations. Officeholders are always thinking of the elections, and are, furthermore, subjected to the whims of the politicians, who can either turn them out of office or prevent their advancement. The result is that State officials, whatever their grade may be, are not free agents in matters electoral. The Government in France does not hesitate, on the eve of an election, to send officials a circular letter ordering them to support the Government's candidates. The consequence is that the liberty of choice at the ballot-box, and, therefore, political liberty, is sadly infringed upon in a country and among a people where the central Government enjoys extensive powers. The transferring of officials to another post and their dismissal on account of political hostility or even lukewarmness is a common occurrence in France.

Germany furnished recently a striking example of Government pressure, though of a somewhat different character from those just mentioned. I refer to the Prussian Government stopping all orders of railway material from the Graffenstadten works in Alsace, for the openly declared reason that this concern had at its head a director who was unfriendly to Germany. The company was given clearly to understand that this policy would be continued so long as this objectionable person remained at his post. After some hesitation the board of directors removed him. This pressure from a Government operating an important railway

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

system is not always exercised in such a bold fashion, but it makes itself felt almost always either openly or secretly. The consequence is that here again the political liberty of the citizen is infringed upon.

There is an objection of still another sort, and a very grave one, against State ownership of public utilities. To meet the demands of one kind and another which they entail, the Government is obliged to be continually borrowing. But repeated loans depreciate public credit, so that in a grave crisis a Government finds it difficult to obtain loans necessary to the very life of the nation. Many examples of this might be given. Take Russia, for example. Before the outbreak in 1904 of the Russo-Japanese War the Tsar's Government took over the larger part of the railways and began operating them, which greatly increased the country's debt; for the Government, to meet this expense and make the necessary extensions, was obliged to negotiate a big loan almost every year, the result being that at the moment of the commencement of hostilities, the debt had attained 16 or 17 milliards of francs. The defeats came and then the credit of Russia collapsed. The public of England and France recalled that even in peace times the Russian Government was forced to borrow annually, but it was not remembered that this money was for the building of railways. So the Russian 5 per cents. fell below 80. There can be no doubt that if Russia had not squandered so many milliards in buying and building railways, but had left all this to private companies, her debt would have been less and the moral effect produced by this immense total would have been less harmful. It required four or five years after the peace for Russian credit to recover itself, and during that period the Government could borrow only on very hard terms and could not renew the rolling-stock of her railways or go on with their extension. But if the roads had been in the possession of companies with shareholders in France, Belgium, and Holland, for example, the money would have been easily found. In fact, the Russian Government has been compelled to hand back to private companies a large part of its roads in order not to be obliged each year to go abroad seeking money and thus weaken still further its foreign credit.

A similar but less pronounced example of this same thing is furnished by Germany. It cannot be denied that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Germany is a prosperous country, and its situation both at home and abroad, appears to be very solid. Yet the German public funds are relatively low, considerably below the French. The difference is relatively enormous, and there is a tendency for it to go on falling. In 1898 the German 3 per cents. were only 5 or 6 points below the French 3 per cents., the average figure of the first being 95 and the second 100½. But in June of the past year there was a difference of 14 points, the German 3 per cents. being quoted at 79 and the French 3 per cents. at 93½. Several reasons have been advanced to explain this difference, but it seems to me that the principal one has been overlooked. For twenty years France has asked no public loan, the French Government, until the taking over of the Western Railway in 1908, abstaining from any large scheme requiring a great amount of capital, whereas the German Government, and especially the Prussian Government, owning and operating the State railways, have been obliged and are still obliged to borrow every year in order to better the existing lines and to construct new ones. The result is that the French public funds have never been brought into competition with new loans, while the existing German public funds have to meet, and are still meeting every year, the competition and pressure occasioned by these new issues of Government bonds. In fact, this singular situation has come to pass: German public funds are now lower than those of Italy, Switzerland, and even Norway. At the end of last June, German 3½ per cents. were selling at 90, while Italian 3½, notwithstanding the war with Turkey, the uncertainty as to how it will end, and the expenses occasioned thereby, were worth 97.80; Swiss 3½, 91 and 92; and Norwegian 3½, 91 and 93. This depression in the public funds of Germany might also be partly attributed to the expenses of the navy, but the fact remains that if Prussia and the German States were not burdened with the construction and the operation of the railways of the country, the German Empire would not be asking at every moment for money and its credit would not stand so low as it does.

It is a source of unquestionable strength for a nation to have good credit, especially at the moment of some great crisis which may come at any hour. At such a time those who have money to lend, knowing that the French 3 per cents. have stood for more than a quarter of a century in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the neighborhood of par and even above, would be more disposed to subscribe to a public loan required by the circumstances of the moment and at a rate that would not be a burden to the country. Our fine position in this respect has, however, been somewhat marred since we took over and began operating the Western Railway. In order to extend its system, the Government this present year has had to borrow 300,000,000 francs, and this will have to be repeated in the immediate years to come; so this loan, with the 8 to 9 million to follow, will unquestionably have a weakening effect on French credit. Though these new bonds are of a different sort from our 3 per cents., the latter have already declined 2 per cent. and are now vacillating.

I need not dwell longer on this question of State ownership. From the point of view of pure political economy there can be no question that it is an evil. Nor is the conclusion less positive when the matter is considered from a sociological, a political, or a financial point of view.

PAUL LEROY-BEAULIEU.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

AMERICAN LIBRARIES AND THE INVESTIGATOR

BY HERBERT PUTNAM

THE characteristic development of American libraries during the past half-century has been in the "popularization" of their service. Induced by a sense of obligation to the more general public, this has implied a special attention to what is called "the general reader." It has involved not merely schemes for attracting him, simplification of the apparatus with which he must deal in reaching the books, and a greater diversity of personal service in interpreting the collections to his taste or need, but also, in the choice of the books to be acquired and emphasis upon those adapted to his taste or calculated to meet his need. As regards his taste, these may be the most ordinary editions, for he is not engaged in those studies which require comparison of texts; and in the literature of knowledge, his need being for a lucid and also interesting presentation of fact, it will, as a rule, be satisfied, and even best served, by those books which expound and interpret. It does not require those which are the "original sources."

But the scholar, the investigator, cannot be so satisfied. He must have, in pure literature, the variant editions from the earliest; and in the literature of science (including history), the original sources. What during the half-century has been done for him by our libraries? In what case is an American scholar to-day who wishes to pursue his researches without a trip abroad?

A recent publication of the Bureau of Education helps to answer this question. It is a list, grouped by subject, of the "special collections" in the libraries of the United States. It offers thus a conspectus of the literature available here to one pursuing research in any one of the numer-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ous fields of knowledge. It is based not on an examination of the libraries, but on reports from the authorities in charge of them. It is thus necessarily defective; for even assuming the response to have been painstaking, it will in the case of the larger research libraries limit its specifications to the groups which stand out from the general collection, assuming that if the latter is not already familiar, it is, at any rate, too large and too diversified to be described within the compass of such a report. Yet it may be this very general collection whose strength is important, for it will be the one which will be apt to contain that vast body of miscellanea, touching every department of knowledge, which is the fiber and backbone of a good "working library."

The "special collections" reported will, on the other hand, be apt to be merely those which, acquired *en bloc,* by gift or purchase, and for some reason kept distinct, are recorded and referred to by some special title, or the name of the collector or of the donor. Even thus the list is suggestive.

The two features which first strike the attention are, the geographical location of the research material in general, and the lack of concentration in any particular institution of the material in a particular field which might result from its situation, its constituency, or the specialization of its collections under some general agreement.

A map of the United States indicating the present distribution of population would show over two-thirds of it to lie west of the Alleghanies. The present center of population is a point in southern Indiana. But of the three hundred odd institutions reporting in this list only forty lie west of the Alleghanies, and of these ten—no less than a quarter—are in Chicago, or the neighboring burg of Evanston. Apart, indeed, from Chicago, the research collections in the Middle, the Western, and the Southern States are exceedingly few, cover but sparse areas in literature, and these, if we except the material local to the region, areas of little apparent importance or relevance to any distinctive need. A great "source" collection in Pacific-coast history (such as the H. H. Bancroft) is logically fitting and useful at Berkeley. A notable collection on Australia may render good service in seminar and thesis work at Palo Alto, since any interest in continents beyond the Pacific naturally affects the higher studies along the Pacific slope. But the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

availability at the University of California of a notable collection on the French Revolution is due only to the fortunate accident of the presence in its faculty of an historian who has "collected" on that subject. Similarly the collection on ichthyology at Leland Stanford, due to the presence there of Dr. Jordan. Among other collections whose location is traceable especially to such personal contact or interest are the Hopkins (also at Stanford) on railways; the J. J. Hill (at Madison) on railway economics; the Stearns (at Ann Arbor) on musical instruments; or the Swante Palm (at Austin, Texas) on Swedish history; the last named a wide reach indeed from the natural site of material in this field, which is of course either Chicago, Minnesota, or Wisconsin. That Dutch history should be a prime concern of the libraries of New York is obvious; but one would not look for a special collection on early Amsterdam in a library at Chicago (the John Crerar), nor one on Arctic exploration in a library at Cleveland, especially not in one whose devotion is particularly to the history of the mid-West. And by what happy, if illogical, chance has Ann Arbor come to be possessed of a collection—worthy of emphasis—on the early history of Ireland, or De Pauw, in Indiana, of one on Martial, or, for that matter, a Wisconsin historical society of a collection of Dutch literature, or a theological seminary at Chicago of a collection of Egyptology, or another seminary at Atlanta of a collection on the Greek-Russian Church?

On the history and literature of the particular denominations which sustain them the seminaries of the West have collected considerable records, but it is as widely dissociate as they are scattered: the Wesley movement may be studied at Evanston (in the Garrett Institute), the Lutheran at Rock Island and Dubuque, the Methodist Episcopal (South) at St. Louis, the Unitarian at Berkeley; but a *comparative* study would require a visit to all of these places. For theology in general even the considerable collections in Chicago might not exempt the student from an examination of the sixteenth and seventeenth century material in the College of Mount St. Clement at De Soto, Missouri, or the texts or exegesis in St. Anselm's at St. Meinrad, Indiana. And if in Semitica he can get along without a trip to the preeminent collection in the Jewish Theological Seminary in New York, he may still find one desirable to that of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Hebrew Union College in Cincinnati. The study of Mormonism may be pursued at Chicago, but may require recourse to Madison and to Lincoln, Nebraska.

In science there is but a note here and there of any special collection of significance outside of Chicago. In botany the most notable in the West is that of the Missouri Botanical Garden at St. Louis; but there is thought also worthy of report the collection in the Lloyd Library at Cincinnati—also stated to be strong in *materia medica* and pharmacy; while the State Laboratory of Natural History at Urbana, Illinois, boasts distinction in the literature of economic entomology, and especial attraction for those pursuing the fascinating themes of the "phylla vermes" and the "arthropoda." The anatomist may, however, need to examine the Wilhelmhis collection, and the ophthalmologist the Cohn collection, at the University of Minnesota, and the investigator into the theory of grain rusts the literature of mycology also there; just as the student of iron-ore deposits may have to familiarize himself with the Kimball collection at Seattle, and the ichthyologist, as already indicated, with the Jordan collection at Palo Alto, or the microscopist with the collection of the San Francisco Society deposited at Berkeley.

The purchases for a university library are, as a rule, determined by the several faculties. Naturally, then, the emphasis will vary according to the vigor and enterprise of the several department chiefs for the time being; but with also a recognition of the fact that in certain departments the library itself being the laboratory, and the books necessary apparatus, their claims are entitled to preference. Particularly will this be true in history, in literature, and in the social sciences. Yet it is chiefly in the classical literatures that special collections are reported: as the Schulze and the Scherer at Evanston, the Reifferschied at Lake Forest, the Dittenberger at Urbana, the Kirchoff at Reno. The titles of these indicate their origin—the private library of some German professor acquired *en bloc*. Plato Alto names the Hildebrand in Germanic and Ann Arbor the Walter in Romance, together with a distinction not to be overlooked in the literature of Julius Cæsar, Goethe, Shakespeare, and the early English drama.

In the social sciences and sociology the mention of distinctive collections is meager: the Rau at Madison, Masonry

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

at Cedar Rapids. But in the foregoing notes I have included practically all of the places and the institutions reporting located west of the Alleghanies, except those in Chicago itself. Chicago contains (besides the public library, whose chief responsibility is, however, the general reader, and the Northwestern University with its fine Gary collection of law) three powerful collections for research. They are those of the University, of the Newberry Library, and of the John Crerar. The latter two, endowed and having divided the field between them, insure the most efficient development within their respective areas: the Crerar devoting itself to the natural, physical, and social sciences (including medicine); the Newberry specializing in history, philosophy, arts, and letters. Philology and pure science are, naturally, for the most part left to the University pursuant to its service as an academic library.* The united collections of these three institutions now number over seven hundred volumes, and the resources which in the aggregate they present to the investigator are indeed not merely prospectively, but in fact, formidable. They are, however, be it observed, concentrated in a single city within this vast area (west and south of the Alleghanies) embracing over two million square miles and two-thirds of the population of the United States. They are at an average distance of perhaps a thousand miles from a given investigator within this area. And outside of them, though the libraries are numerous and many of them constitute good "working" collections, some of them specialized material for the study of the locality; few, indeed, of them possess material important for original research in outside fields.

East of the Alleghanies the situation is far more favorable. There are indeed discrepancies, for while the main concentration is in a metropolis (New York), some of the most highly specialized collections are scattered elsewhere. Three university libraries—at Cambridge, Ithaca, and New Haven—are indispensable to the investigation of certain fields;† the Boston Public Library contains the Barton collection

* Yet the Lucien Bonaparte collection is not in the University Library, but in the Newberry.

† The student of philology, of literature, and of European history must visit Harvard; the student of Dante, of Petrarch, of Icelandic literature, or of certain fields of history must have recourse to the Willard Fiske and Andrew White collections at Cornell; the student of Oriental literature cannot avoid a visit to New Haven.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(Shakespeariana) and the Ticknor (Spanish literature); Wellesley College has the Plimpton collection (Tasso, Ariosto, and other Italian contemporaries); while the most notable collection of early Americana (wherever published) is at Providence. The investigator in statistics may need to consult the library of the American Statistical Society at Boston, while the Orientalist seeking original texts as well as commentaries may have to oscillate between New Haven, New York, Princeton, Brunswick, Philadelphia, and Baltimore.

Yet the distances thus to be traversed are not prohibitive; and if to the resources of the New England and mid-Atlantic States we add those of the District of Columbia, the aggregate may seem impressive. In mere bulk it is; and a map of the United States graphically representing it would show this territory east of the Alleghanies deeply shaded, while that to the south and west, with the exception of a dark block in northern Illinois, would be white or of the lightest gray.

But the relative smallness of the area suggests another question: how far is this near proximity of these collections inducing a subdivision of the field of literature, which, by concentrating the funds of a particular institution or group of institutions upon a specified subject, shall insure the greatest possible aggregate of research material in the institutions as a whole? Unhappily, the evidence of such a subdivision is small. Not merely does each institution accept without demur, even courts, collections having no relevance to its locality or immediate service, it even goes further and applies its unrestricted funds to an attempt at an independent "comprehensiveness" of its own. The explanation is in part, perhaps, an inconsiderate vanity; but it is also, doubtless, the lack thus far of a system of inter-library loans sufficiently general to enable the unusual books in one collection to respond to the unusual need addressed to another.

The disposition to lend such books is in certain libraries quite notable; and the practice—as at Harvard—conforms to it. It is indeed recognized by a present committee of the American Library Association charged to formulate rules and methods for such loans. But the adoption of a general system, and one applicable generally to all classes of research material, finds in this group of libraries two obstacles: one, the fact that the particular book desired may be part

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of a collection which by the terms of some gift or bequest cannot "circulate" outside of the institution; the other, some administrative rule or policy which regards the utility of the collection as proportioned to its completeness on the shelves for the reference use of a resident or visiting investigator. Every one of the large research libraries of the East holds collections subject to one or the other of such limitations. The Astor and Lenox collections in the New York Public Library are instances, or the John Carter Brown, a collection exclusively for reference use. The legal limitation where it exists is, of course, a fact and conclusive, and the administrative policy has much in its favor. It is and has always been the policy of the British Museum; and it has been deliberately adopted as the policy of the John Crerar at Chicago. In the case of the British Museum it is the less of a hardship because the collection is in a great metropolis, within a few hours' travel from any point in the British Isles. New York City is also a great metropolis, and much might be urged in favor of the policy of reserve there.

Its result, however, together with the effect of limitations purely legal, is to tie up within narrow areas of the East great masses of material important for research. It is not, therefore, the libraries of the East from which the investigator residing in the West or South can expect loans.

There remain the governmental libraries at Washington. These, with collections subject to no such limitations either legal or the result of administrative policy, have also an apparent duty to the country as a whole, since they are Federal and maintained by the country as a whole.

They include collections comprehensive—certain of them pre-eminent—in particular fields of science—as the library of the Geographical Survey, that of the Department of Agriculture, and that of the Surgeon-General's Office; but also the Library of Congress, which, while deferring to the specialties of the others, undertakes *all* fields. Of these, the library of the Surgeon-General's office, with its incomparable collection in medicine, surgery, and hygiene, instituted years ago the policy of liberal loans to distant inquirers; and there is no one of them that would refuse a request based upon a serious need.

With the Library of Congress the policy of loan was adopted after its removal to the new building and, incidental-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ly, to the nationalization of its service there. Its disposition is complete and embraces all classes of material not within the duty of a local institution to supply, with the sole reservation of that which cannot at the moment be spared from Washington, or that which from its bulk or character cannot be risked in transportation. This latter does not exclude from the loans material that is costly, rare, or difficult to replace, for it may be exactly such that will be most urgently needed because unavailable elsewhere. The policy in vogue, therefore, makes actually available to an investigator in any part of the United States the resources represented by its two million printed books and pamphlets and a large portion of the million other items, including its collection of music, many scores from which (unique in this country) have from time to time been forwarded to distant points to convenience a serious investigator. Such an investigator has only to apply to his local library, which requests the loan in his behalf. He must, however, meet the expense of transportation. And it is this which at present prevents a large development in the volume of the service. The parcels post recently enacted does not include such material, and while ten pounds of butter may be conveyed on a rural free-delivery route for fourteen cents, ten pounds of books would cost eighty cents.

A book, or at least a library, post which would favor literature at least equally with the ordinary articles of commerce, is so obviously just that the demand for it ought to be pressed to success. Certainly as applied to interlibrary loans it ought to meet with no objection. It would not give undue advantage to the large department store in the great centers doing a mail-order business to the detriment of the local dealer. Its purpose would not be commercial at all, but educational and scientific; and to favor it would be quite consistent with the general policy of the mails.

Its effect in evening conditions over this huge expanse of country would be incalculable. For it is a mistake to assume that important research is carried on only at the centers of population, or even at the larger academic centers. In original research it is the man who counts. And in the smaller communities, especially, of course, in the smaller colleges all over this country, there are men competent for it, eager to undertake it, who are handicapped by the lack of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

material. If it require a laboratory, the lack cannot be made good from elsewhere. But if it require merely a book it may be, and if it can be made good by the Federal Government, it ought to be. For the loan of a book is not a subsidy in the sense that it takes something substantial from other people for his benefit. His use draws nothing from the book which does not still remain there; and his use concluded, the book returns undiminished in its competence to render a similar service elsewhere.

It *does* return, for so secure is transportation to-day that since the inauguration of the system not a single item has been lost in transit. Abroad a similar experience; and in Germany, in Italy, and elsewhere masses of material, even precious and unique manuscripts, are sent from one end of the country to another without demur or apprehension.

The early purpose of these governmental collections at Washington was, of course, the service to the Government itself in its several departments—legislative, executive, and judicial. The creation, under the executive, of scientific bureaus necessarily widened their scope; for the work of these bureaus, while tending to some "practical" aim, in fact involves theoretic investigation in almost every branch of science. The amount annually expended in such investigation exceeds that of a number of other Governments put together. Its rapid enlargement in recent times is evidenced by the fact that in the Department of Agriculture alone the annual appropriations have increased during the past fifteen years from three to twenty-five millions of dollars. The collections have expanded correspondingly, so that outside of the Library of Congress itself these embrace now nearly a million and a half volumes. The strength of certain of these I have already indicated. For the scientist they are complemented by numerous items acquired by the Library of Congress with the deliberate aim of complementing them; and also by the great collection there of the publications of learned societies (exchanges of the Smithsonian) which, embodying the first communication of the results of scientific investigation, are the prime "source material" in the literature of science; and by the pre-eminent collection, also there, of the publications of foreign Governments received through international exchange.

This latter collection furnishes also essential resource for the investigator in history, in administration, in politics,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and in law; its 350,000 volumes recording not merely the enactments, but the legislative proceedings of most of the nations of the globe. Auxiliary to them are the files of miscellaneous serials—some fifteen thousand of which are currently received—and of representative newspapers. Years ago it was ascertained that of some 2,000 sets—mostly serial—requisite for the study of European history, only two-thirds were to be found in the libraries of the United States as a whole. The defect is, doubtless, receiving the attention of many libraries; at the Library of Congress it has induced the placing of orders for every item lacking.

In law, the richest single collection in the United States is still, doubtless, that at Harvard. But the collection at Washington is being developed rapidly, as becomes its proper future as the library of our highest tribunal and as the appropriate source of knowledge of the laws of all foreign countries; not merely those under which they have developed, but those under which they are living and acting to-day. For the student of comparative jurisprudence it is likely that this collection will offer the completest resources to be found in this country.

In history, the source material (except as it may be monuments) is manuscript; and the manuscript sources of foreign history are and will substantially remain, abroad. In the history of America, however, in which the interest of American historians largely lies and to which the duty of this national library particularly applies, a scheme of transcript and of facsimile is bringing to Washington exact *reproductions* of the important documents which will save to many an investigator a trip abroad.

The literature of sociology is itself chiefly secondary in form, and in printed sources reasonably procurable. While investigations highly specialized may, therefore, require recourse to such a collection as the Ely or the Gerritsen at Chicago (in which many a fugitive pamphlet has been preserved), the main body of it will in the ordinary course become available in the national collection.

Nor are these, though the natural, the only fields in which the Library of Congress offers, or will offer, material for investigation independent of local conditions. Its acquisitions have included certain collections *en bloc,* which represent distinctive strength in unexpected fields; the Albrecht Weber collection in Indology, for instance; the Huitfeldt-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Kaas in Scandinavian history and literature; the Yudin in Russian and Siberian history, institutions, and literature (the last named the richest, perhaps, outside of Russia). And if we add the collection of maps, of music, and of prints, the prospective acquisitions in the literature proper of the fine arts and architecture, and the department of Semitica recently founded by a notable gift and with assurances favorable to its future, it will be apparent that in theory, at least, the library eschews no department of the literature of knowledge.

Which is not to say that recourse to it could now, or will ever, exempt an investigator (particularly in history, in theology, or in language and literature) from a visit to the research libraries of the more northern East, or from drafts upon them.

The more reason, then, for the inauguration among them of a policy of differentiation among themselves that will insure the most efficient application of their own resources as a whole; the avoidance on the part of each of expenditure — either for acquisition or for administration — in specialized material either unnecessary for its immediate service or unnecessarily duplicating what is already or might be made sufficiently available elsewhere; and such a liberality in the treatment of it as shall promote research in general and not merely that of the immediate locality.

Included in this treatment should be not merely the actual loan of particular books, but a wide dissemination of information as to the contents of their collections that may have distinctive value. This may consist of prompt and generous response to any particular inquiry, but it ought to include a permanent exhibit at various points of at least portions of their catalogues. The present system of card catalogue, with the cards printed, offers opportunity for this. It enables the Library of Congress, for instance, to place at some fifty different institutions which are centers of investigations what will constitute such a complete exhibit of its printed books and pamphlets. And "union" catalogues, consolidating with these sets, cards which represent distinctive books or editions not in the Library of Congress but available in some other collection, ought to be available not merely at Boston, at New York, and at Chicago (where to some extent they are already in process), but at certain other places as well.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Should a differentiation in these fields be attempted, what should be its basis? A definition universally applicable would be impracticable, for within any particular area it must take account of the existing situation; and in proportion to the area it may have to be modified. An exhaustive collection on marriage at the John Crerar may well exempt other Chicago libraries from specializing in this particular topic, but a Dante collection at Ithaca may not render unnecessary a considerable Dante collection at Cambridge, for the faculties and students of Harvard also are engaged in original investigations which require the main source books as well as the commentaries for continuous service there. In this latter case it is only the rare and rarely needed volume, which—liberality in loan being assumed—should not be duplicated. Certain general principles may, however, be posited, among them these:

1. The functions of the particular library should be considered, its local constituency, or its choice of constituency, and its control of its own development. A municipal library, with a duty primarily to the diffusion rather than the advance of learning, is in a different case from an academic library which is looked to to promote the research work of its faculties; and both of these are in a different case from an endowed library, such as the Crerar, the Newberry, or the Lenox, which were free to select a field and, incidentally, a constituency; or from the Carter Brown, which, by the terms of its foundation, has both field and constituency determined for it.

2. A library already pre-eminent in a specialty should be allowed to pursue it, if its resources permit.

3. Research in any given subject tending to ramify into many fields of literature, the greatest practicable *concentration* of material in a few main centers, will tend to convenience it. Special collections—not merely local—proposed as gifts should, therefore, be directed to the libraries at such centers rather than to some outlying point where they will be ineffective in their isolation. The present main centers would, perhaps, be Boston, New York, Chicago, and Washington; the last named because, though not a center of population, it is the national capital. Its present collections are large and in some fields pre-eminent; they are already consulted by numerous investigators (and, incidentally, serve as an invigorating or cultivating influence

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

upon thousands of ordinary visitors); and being under a national authority, with a duty to the country as a whole, their service is made to reach out, where possible, to the entire country. The existence at Washington of a great museum and of scientific laboratories, such as those of the Bureau of Standards and that (in geophysics) of the Carnegie Institution, all freely hospitable to a visiting investigator, also insures there an effective use of the literature of science in connection with the concrete investigations if in science, just as the presence there of Congress, of the Federal Executive, and of the Supreme Court offers unique opportunity for observation in the field of law, politics, and administration, and the presence of the Carnegie Bureau of Historical Research promotes it in the study of history.

With a differentiation in effect, and the co-operation with interchange of service, which is a condition of it, we may see beyond the American zeal in acquisition which brings masses of precious material to this country, and then cumulates it in a few favored centers; we may see the American talent for efficiency applying itself to the diffusion of this material in a service to American scholarship as a whole.

HERBERT PUTNAM.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE COMMERCIAL AWAKENING OF THE MORO AND PAGAN

BY MAJOR JOHN P. FINLEY, UNITED STATES ARMY

In the United States the army has been the forerunner of civilization throughout our great Western empire, preparing vast territories for Statehood and cementing an indissoluble union. It has helped the Cuban people to take all the successive steps necessary to the establishment of their own constitutional government and transferred that government to them amid universal expressions of friendship and good-will. It co-operated with the navy in breaking the power of Spain in the Pacific and in acquiring dominion therein, which suddenly elevated the United States to a world power and severed the bonds of provincialism. It has crushed and terminated a great insurrection, February 4, 1899, to July 4, 1902, in the vast Philippine Archipelago, with its 3,141 islands and islets and its total land and water area of 832,968 square miles. It reared a stable government upon the ashes of the Philippine insurrection and transferred the body politic intact and vigorous to the civil authorities on July 1, 1901.

Thus from a state of enervating peace the military forces of the country were suddenly mobilized, following the destruction of the *Maine* on February 15, 1898, and never ceased from incessant conflict until the proclamation of peace and amnesty in the Philippines, issued by the President on July 4, 1902. The dual process by which the military power had steadily and consistently acquired control, and exercised the authority of government over the various provinces of the Archipelago and, at the same time, had been superseded progressively by civil administration, was then terminated, and a complete system of civil government, constructed under the President's instructions of April 7, 1900,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was in operation ready to proceed under the authority of Congress as expressed in the Philippine Government Act of July 1, 1902.

The establishment of civil government in the Christian provinces of the Philippines did not separate the army from another function devolving upon it, in the control and development of the Moros and Pagans of the southern islands of the Archipelago.

The instructions of the President to the Philippine Commission of April 7, 1900, contained the following reference to these people:

"In dealing with the uncivilized tribes of the Islands the Commission should adopt the same course followed by Congress in permitting the tribes of our North-American Indians to maintain their tribal organization and government, and under which many of those tribes are now living in peace and contentment, surrounded by a civilization to which they are unable or unwilling to conform. Such tribal governments should, however, be subjected to wise and firm regulation, and without undue or petty interference constant and active effort should be exercised to prevent barbarous practices and introduce civilized customs."

These instructions also provide that the military forces in the Philippines shall be at all times subject, under the orders of the military commander, to the call of the civil authorities for the maintenance of law and order and for the enforcement of their authority.

The above instructions were approved and adopted by Congress on July 1, 1902, and the Secretary of War directed that they would continue to guide the civil and military authorities in the Philippines in their dealings with the Moros and Pagans.

In regard to the control of the non-Christian tribes, Mr. Root as Secretary of War, said:

"The questions to be worked out in that process are altogether apart from the general questions of government in the Philippines, and such measures of force as are necessary to control the various Moro tribes have no more relation to the recent Philippine insurrection than our troubles with the Sioux or the Apaches had to do with the suppression of the Southern Rebellion."

Thus we have presented a distinct announcement of the Moro problem, and of its general relation to the other problems in the Philippines, before the Government of the United States.

After the inauguration of Judge Taft (President of the Philippine Commission) as the first American Civil Gov-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ernor of the Philippines on July 4, 1901, he early gave consideration to the Moro problem and said, in his annual report for 1901:

"It is evident that if we are not to fail in our duty toward the savage or half-civilized people of these islands, active measures must be taken for the gathering of reliable information concerning them as a basis for legislation."

This view of the matter resulted in the enactment of a law providing for the organization and operation of the Bureau of Non-Christian Tribes, which was later absorbed, by further legislation, into the Bureau of Science, now the home of the principal scientific divisions of the Insular Government.

From the study thus engaged in Governor Taft proceeded, by his usual thorough and conservative methods, to the development of a special form of government to deal with the complex and peculiar questions confronting the civil and military authorities in the Moro country. It was a deep and perplexing study, for no precedent existed in the United States that fully measured up to the requirements of the situation. Our Indian problems were somewhat similar, but the details of administration and the powerful influences of caste and religion had to be worked out on a different basis. The final result of this absorbing application to the essentials of a new subject was the enactment by the Philippine Commission on June 1, 1903, of Act No. 787 as the organic law of the Moro Province. Its law-making body was styled the legislative council, and the enacting clause of its laws required the form, "by authority of the Philippine Commission, be it enacted by the legislative council of the Moro Province." The semi-independent character of this new government can be seen by comparing its law-enacting clause with that required of the Commission, as "by authority of the United States, be it enacted by the Philippine Commission." An examination of the organic act shows that the Commission granted to the legislative council a very large measure of discretion in dealing with the Moros (Mohammedans) and in preserving, as far as possible, consistent with the fundamental act, the customs of the Moros, the authority of the Datus, and a system of justice in which Moros and Pagans could take part.

Having thus provided for a rational system of administering justice among the non-Christians, attention was directed to their industrial development. Both of these fields of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

social and physical betterment had been neglected under Spanish dominion. The main idea with the Spanish conquerors was the spread of Catholicism and the establishment of the authority of the Papal Church. The various orders of the Church engaged in considerable conflict over the assignment of territory, methods of administration, and the accumulation of property. Both Moros and Pagans resisted with violence the proselytism of these orders. Dogmatic frontal attacks upon their systems of religion were not calculated to gain their confidence and co-operation. All attempts at conversion to Christianity among the Moros resulted in complete failure. The natives stood in dire need of industrial and educational betterment and would have welcomed such assistance. A very large measure of the three hundred years of irritation, conflict, rapine and degradation could have been avoided by the more rational line of approach. For centuries the hill people (Pagans and farmers) and the coast people (Mohammedans and traders) had been and were still in serious conflict, because at variance in matters of religion and trade. The Spanish Missionaries, with a combination of Church and State, widened the breach of discord between the Moros and Pagans by forcibly introducing another system of religion, opposed to each class of natives, and ignoring entirely the only feasible plan of amalgamation, through harmonizing the trade relations of the factional races. With the advent of American control, involving a separation of Church and State, the irritating element of a new religion, imposed as part of the system of government, was avoided at the outset. When this fact was made clear to the Moros and Pagans by Governor Finley, through numerous public meetings *(bicharas)* held with them, a bond of sympathy and a basis of co-operation began to be established, which has steadily grown in strength and influence. Taking advantage of this favorable situation, Governor Finley sought to remove the animosities in trade relations, between the hill people and the coast people, a matter of vast importance to each of the two races and of vital import to the Government in establishing a successful system of control over these people. Similar conditions gave rise in 1904–1907 to the great Pulajan insurrection in the island of Samar between the Pulajans (hill people) and the Dagattaus (coast people), finally terminated by the provisions of Act 1,759, Philippine

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Commission, of October 10, 1907, establishing proper trade relations between these factions. The hill people crave salt, sea foods, and manufactured articles, whereas the coast people demand for food, vegetables, cereals and tobacco; and for trade a large variety of forest products only gathered by the hill people. These articles are the products of totally different occupations among Moros and Pagans, and so maintained with much scrupulosity between hill tribes and coast tribes, as, for example, between the Yakans and the Samals, and between the Subanuns and Kalibugans.

In the matter of manufactured articles, such as cloth, beads, steel, gambier, wire, and so forth, the hill people have traded at coast towns with Chinese, Europeans and Filipinos, and have generally suffered seriously through graft and extortion. The exchange would be made in kind and the ignorant farmer from the hills, not informed as to the current market prices, would be swindled unmercifully. This form of imposition, in addition to the *pamuka* system of enforced taxation, carried out by the native chiefs, reduced the *taus* (common people) to a state of cruel bondage, deprived them of everything but scanty subsistence, and accumulated debts which were deliberately employed to enslave the debtor and his family.

In his annual report for 1904 General Wood wrote on this subject:

> "There has been much said about the paternal form of Moro slavery, but after a year of almost continuous contact with the Moros, in all of the principal districts of the Moro Province, it can be stated that it would be difficult to imagine a worse form of slavery. The slave had absolutely no rights. His wife, his daughters, and his property were entirely subject to the will of his owner, and he himself could be sold or even killed with impunity."

From the inception of the Moro problem, under American control, to the present time the slavery question has received the earnest attention and the most humane consideration due it, by the successive commanding generals of the Department of Mindanao and Jolo, from the days of General Bates to the present régime of General Pershing. The slave Act No. 8 of the Moro Province was prepared by General Wood and enacted by the legislative council September 24, 1903.

In October and November, 1903, Governor Finley called at Zamboanga the first durbars or conferences ever held

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

among the Moros and Pagans, and which were attended by several thousand people. At these meetings slavery, the prohibition of the possession and use of firearms and cutting weapons, the opening of markets and other public questions were discussed, and, as far as practicable, the purpose and policy of the American Government were announced. Following the meetings, Governor Finley spent much time in visiting the principal Moro *rancherias,* looking into the surroundings and needs of the people and selecting locations for markets and trading-places, ascertaining native products and their values, and pointing the way for better trading and more profitable methods of agriculture. The natives were also instructed regarding the introduction and use of the standard currency of the Philippines and how to exchange debased coins for the new standard. In all of this work the Moros and Pagans took deep interest, especially the common people. Too often it was apparent that the chiefs were not in favor of a change that meant the independence of their ignorant followers. But the leaven soon began to work and the real producers of the country were eager to learn from Governor Finley his plans for their industrial emancipation. Then began a series of meetings at which the plans and purposes of the Moro Exchange system were unfolded to the anxious and earnest tillers of the soil, who longed for freedom from the terrors of slavery and the crushing burdens of the *pamuka* system of taxation. These long-suffering people eagerly subscribed their mites (offering stock, products or money, according to their possessions) to aid in the construction of the parent Moro Exchange at Zamboanga, which was completed and opened with a great celebration and fiesta on September 1, 1904. All classes of people joined with the government officials in making the occasion a notable event. The Moros and Pagans crowded the big market-place with their products and wares, which by nightfall were almost entirely disposed of. In that unique emporium of wild men, the first of its kind ever gathered under the tropical sun of Moro land, slaves jostled masters and felt the first thrills of freedom and the quickening impulse of self-control, in the possession of that which was lawfully and rightfully theirs, as the product of their own ingenuity and labor. Thus opened the first (parent) exchange and trading store in the history of Moro land, formally and lawfully established under the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

provisions of Act No. 55 of the legislative council of the Moro Province, enacted June 14, 1904.

Since then to June 30, 1911, branch exchanges and trading stores have been established at thirty other Moro *rancherias* in the District of Zamboanga and at several *rancherias* in the other districts of the Moro Province.

As a consequence the volume of business has steadily increased as has also the general prosperity among the Moros and Pagans. More of the standard money of the Islands is in circulation among these people than ever before in their history. Through the association made possible by these exchanges a much better feeling of sympathy and helpfulness has arisen between the Mohammedans and Pagans. The former have become more tolerant in their religious views and more willing to seek co-operation for mutual benefit along the lines of commercial and agricultural development. The Moros are now disposed to look upon the despised and hated Pagan hill people as worthy of consideration, because, through the influence of commercial association, developed by the Moro Exchange system, these natural and long-time enemies have found a common ground on which they can get together, and profit more by friendly association and business ventures than by the process of slavery and extermination.

The Moros and Pagans in Spanish times never took kindly to direct taxation, as made necessary through the imposition of the *cedula,* or poll tax, and the requirements for service on public works. Although accustomed to such a system of imposts as part of their feudal form of government yet the common people always resented the collection of this form of revenue, whether obtained in kind or in legal tender. The chiefs and their *sakopes* (immediate followers) maintained the system as their only means of support, and it was so regulated that it never failed to bring returns, either in money or kind, or in human flesh.

When the American system replaced the feudal one and generally subjected all classes of people to the same imposts, and applied the provisions of law impartially, the chiefs and *sakopes* protested for their immunity, because of class distinction and inability to labor. But they were told that the Moro Exchange system opened the way for them to engage in profitable trade, and that, under the supervision of the government, every man would have an equal chance,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and all participants would soon find a satisfactory return from the results of honest and efficient labor. Thus the Moro Exchange system has become the active agent for awakening the commercial spirit of the uncivilized tribes of the southern islands of the Philippines, has become a powerful instrument for peace and unity among Moros and Pagans, and is serving the public by materially aiding in the collection of public revenues, and thus providing for the general progress of the community.

Since 1907 the Moro Exchange system, first organized in 1903 by Governor Finley in the Moro Province, has been carried into other provinces of the Philippines by the Department of the Interior. In his annual report for 1910 Commissioner Worcester, Secretary of the Interior, says:

"In my opinion, the next important step we should take in stimulating the development of the hill tribes of northern Luzon is to develop trade among them as actively as possible. With this end in view, government exchanges have been started at various places in the Mountain Province and in Nueva Vizcaya. An effort is made to keep these trading stores supplied with the things the people in their vicinity most need. Sales are made at twenty per cent. above cost to defray expenses of maintenance. The exchanges also buy basket-work, wood carvings, weapons and articles of dress which can readily be sold as curios, paying a good price for them in cash. The vender is free to spend his money as he prefers.

"In the Province of Agusan, Mindanao, the exchanges for the use of Pagans are known collectively as the Manobo Stores. In the Province of Palawan the exchanges for the benefit of the Tagbanuas and Moros promise considerable business in the near future."

Commercial development through the Moro Exchange system has opened the way for agricultural development through the agency of the tribal-ward farm system.

In 1907 Governor Finley began to develop the idea of the tribal-ward farm, with a view to encourage the Moros and Pagans to understand, appreciate, and benefit by the homestead provisions of the Philippine Public Land Act. The homestead of sixteen *hectares* (forty acres) is open to every adult non-Christian who is a native of the Philippines, and the cadastral system of surveys and titles inaugurated by Governor-General Forbes and earnestly applied by General Pershing has made it easy and safe for the Moros and Pagans to become landholders under the law.

The tribal-ward farm is established at each tribal-ward headquarters in the District of Zamboanga and consists of the forty acres of homestead authorized by law. The proper

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cultivation of this little farm, under the supervision of government officials, enables the natives of each tribe to observe modern methods of agriculture, their effect in the production of good crops, and in overcoming natural difficulties in plant growth. The tribal-ward farm can be so conducted as to distribute seeds, cuttings and plants, to improve poultry and stock, and to materially aid in defraying the expenses of tribal-ward administration. Thus the Moros and Pagans will be led by daily example, encouragement and incentive to adopt the homestead method and become sources of permanent production in place of parasitic nomads.

Lord Roberts during his long service in India sometimes established and maintained chains of public markets in order to get in touch with the wild tribesmen and lay the foundation for peaceful trade, agricultural development and self-government. He said that these markets

"aided the army in maintaining a useful line of communication and provided for friendly intercourse among tribes who for generations had been at feud with one another. They found in these markets a common ground on which they could meet without cutting throats. These markets by stimulating trade with the troops and with neighboring people resulted in opening the country by means of roads, thus facilitating intercommunication."

It has been clearly evident to the army during its occupation of the southern islands that the regeneration of the uncivilized tribes of that region must be accomplished along industrial lines. That to break the hold of piracy, slavery and degrading peonage, and to substitute therefor the foundation of first principles in popular self-government, among the Moros and Pagans, will require an indefinite period of military control, in accordance with the accepted methods of dual authority, as exemplified in the politico-military system devised by Governor Taft, authorized by the Philippine Commission, and now being worked out by the provincial government at Zamboanga.

In this connection it is well to keep in mind the fact that the Moros and Pagans have informed the Secretary of War and the Governor-General of the Philippines, in public meetings at Zamboanga, that they will not submit to Filipino*

* Filipinos (eight tribes) are Roman Catholic Christians. Moros (twelve tribes) are Mohammedan non-Christians. Pagans (forty-three tribes) are nature-worshiping non-Christians. These are the three native religious classes of the Philippines.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

control but resort to arms against it should political change result in removing American authority in the southern islands. The Moros desire a continuance of the American military control under which they have existed and progressed since May 19, 1899. They feel that frequent change in authority is not conducive to their well-being, and as they have learned to regard the American army as being strict but just, true to its promises, honest in its dealings with them, impartial in its judgments, and wholly tolerant in religion, it is to the interest of all Mohammedans that such military control should remain undisturbed in the Moro Province. The continued exercise of such authority will avoid serious outbreaks, due to racial animosities, that have been rampant and very destructive in the Philippines, between Mohammedans and Christians, for more than three hundred years. And it will develop a form of administration that will secure a more perfect knowledge of their human nature and therefore a deeper insight into, and greater sympathy with, the feelings and prejudices of these Malayans.

JOHN P. FINLEY.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE PRESIDENCY OF THE FRENCH REPUBLIC

BY JAMES W. GARNER, PROFESSOR OF POLITICAL SCIENCE IN THE UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

THE election in January of this year * of the presidents of the two greatest republics of the world, France and the United States, is a coincidence not without popular interest and one which naturally suggests to many minds a comparison of the two offices from the standpoint of the actual power and influence wielded by their incumbents.

The Presidency of the United States is now generally recognized to be the greatest political office in the world (Mr. Bryce excepts only the Papacy, which, however, is not a political office). President-elect Woodrow Wilson has called attention, with singular clearness of understanding, to the power of the office as it is and as it may become in the hands of a strong man unafraid of responsibility. He conceives the President of the United States to be not merely the legal executive of the country, but the leader of his political party, responsible for the fulfilment of the party pledges, and the guide of the nation in legislation, with a very positive share in the determination and formulation of legislative programmes.

When we turn to the Presidency of the French Republic we find an entirely different type of organization, a different traditional attitude concerning the rôle of the executive, and, consequently, an office which is chiefly decorative in character and without influence—a mere "symbol to please the people," as a distinguished French publicist has characterized it. For a republic it is a singular creation,

* In the United States, January 13th, by the Electoral Colleges assembled in the several States; in France by the National Assembly at Versailles, January 17th.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

representing, as it does, an attempt to combine, rather incongruously, the elective tenure with the position of a constitutional king — that is, a position of irresponsibility, impartiality, and indifference.

Sir Henry Maine, comparing the position of the French President with that of the former kings of France and with that of the President of the United States, once remarked: "There is no living functionary who occupies a more pitiable position than a French President. The old kings of France reigned and governed. The constitutional king, according to M. Thiers, reigns, but does not govern. The President of the United States governs, but he does not reign. It has been reserved for the President of the French neither to reign nor yet to govern."

Viewed in its ceremonial aspects, the office is certainly more imposing than that of the United States, for it has many characteristics which are associated with the royal office in monarchial countries. The honors, military and civil, due the Chief Magistrate are carefully regulated by decree of the Government; *de luxe* trains are placed at his disposal when he travels; when he crosses the boundary of a department he must be met at the frontier by the prefect; when he arrives at his destination the mayor and council of the city are required to greet him; one hundred artillery salutes must be fired in his honor; and the decree contains many detailed regulations regarding escorts of honor, what the bands shall play, what military formations shall be executed in his presence, etc. He is housed in the Palace of the Elysée, and has a summer château at Rambouillet, he is provided with a loge at the opera, he is expressly charged by the Constitution with presiding at national solemnities, he attends inaugurations of many kinds, opens expositions, confers decorations, awards the Grand Prix, and attends the races and the annual military review at Longchamp on July 14th. To enable him to live in a manner befitting a Chief Magistrate whose ceremonial functions are more or less regal in character, he is paid a salary of one hundred and twenty thousand dollars a year and is allowed an equal sum for the maintenance of his household and for traveling expenses.

The impression which one receives from the newspaper accounts of the stately dinners and receptions at the Elysée, of the honors that are accorded the President

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

when he travels, and the respect shown him by the crowned heads of neighboring States when he journeys abroad is that he is a very exalted functionary, and such he is in outward appearance. If we turn to the text of the Constitution and examine the powers which it confers upon him, we also gain the impression that as regards actual governmental authority the President is one of the most powerful executives in any constitutional State. First of all, it vests him in full measure with the usual powers attributed to the chief executives of republican States. Thus he is given the power to appoint, practically without limitation, all civil and military officers and, subject to a few restrictions, the power to remove them—a power the extent of which can only be fully appreciated when we remember that France is a highly centralized State in which almost no public officers, central or local, are popularly elected. He is authorized to convene the Parliament in extraordinary session; to compel it to reconsider measures which he disapproves (a sort of suspensive veto); to recommend measures for its consideration; to oversee the execution of the laws—a power which, according to French interpretation and practice, includes also not only the right to make the ordinances necessary to their execution, but to supplement and to supply many details, for the statutes in France and on the Continent generally rarely descend to details as they do in America; to dispose of the military and naval forces and, by implication, the right to wage defensive war; to receive diplomatic representatives and to negotiate and ratify (with certain exceptions) treaties with foreign powers; to constitute the Senate as a high court of justice for the trial of offenses against the safety of the State; and to grant pardons (though not amnesties) for any and all offenses against the laws and the ordinances.

In addition to this very generous bestowal of authority which in itself would seem to make the French President quite the equal of the President of the United States, the Constitution confers upon him a group of semi-regal powers such as commonly belong only to crowned heads of monarchial States. Thus he is given the power to convoke the two Houses of Parliament and to prorogue their sessions at will (though the power cannot be exercised more than twice during the year); to dissolve, with the consent of the Senate, the Chamber of Deputies; to initiate legislative

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

projects equally with the members of Parliament and to appoint *Commissaires* to appear in the two Houses and represent him in the discussions; to promulgate the laws; to create public offices (for example, ministerial departments); and to appropriate money from the public treasury during the parliamentary recess for the purpose of meeting new and unforeseen expenses unprovided for in the budget, or in case the legislative appropriations for services created by the budget are insufficient.

Taken in their totality, these two categories of functions give the President of France more the character of a constitutional king (minus, of course, the hereditary tenure) than that of an elective executive of a republican State. Indeed, the debates in the National Assembly (1873–1875) on the question of the organization of the executive power show unmistakably that this was the deliberate intention of the authors of the Constitution. A majority of the members of the National Assembly were avowed monarchists, but, being unable to agree among themselves upon the choice of a dynasty, they established the republic very largely upon a monarchial basis and organized the Presidency upon the model of a constitutional king, Louis Philippe being the type most prominently before their eyes.

The republican régime was regarded by the majority of the National Assembly as merely transitory, and they expected that as soon as the royalist factions could agree upon the choice of a king it would give way to the restored monarchy. Meantime the President upon whom the Assembly had conferred all the attributes of an uncrowned king was expected to keep alive monarchial traditions, and as soon as the time became ripe he would be an effective instrument in bringing about the transition from republic to monarchy. In keeping with this idea, the Assembly intrusted the executive power to McMahon, one of the marshals of France and a representative of the reactionary element, rather than to a political leader who believed in republican principles.

The republican members of the Assembly protested against the creation of an executive with such vast powers; he would, they said, be a more powerful magistrate than the President of the Republic of 1848 or the President of the United States; his authority, in fact, would be scarcely less than that of the Emperor under the régime of 1804. Gambetta, addressing the Right in the Assembly, expressed

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the view of the republicans when he said: "We have consented to give you the strongest executive power ever constituted in an elective democratic country." It is clear, therefore, from the affirmations of the monarchists themselves, as well as from the protests of their adversaries, that the National Assembly intended to create and believed that it was creating an executive of real power co-ordinate with the legislative department—a President who was to be the representative of the national sovereignty, and not merely an agent of the Parliament under the absolute control of his ministers.

The fears of the republicans, however, were groundless and their protests unnecessary, for after conferring upon him a group of formidable powers the National Assembly proceeded to paralyze him by decreeing his irresponsibility and by requiring all his official acts to be countersigned by ministers who thereby become responsible to the Parliament for his acts.

It is now the unanimous opinion of the commentators on the French Constitution that the only official act of the President which does not require the signature of a minister is his letter of resignation. The purpose of putting the President under the guardianship of ministers was to prevent him from abusing his authority, from doing arbitrary or illegal acts—that is, from doing what he ought not to do; but the effect has been to prevent him from doing what he is authorized or required by the Constitution to do.

In establishing the irresponsibility of the President the National Assembly violated all republican traditions in France, for under the two earlier republics the principle of executive responsibility was affirmed, and most of the political writers from De Tocqueville to the present have affirmed that the principle of irresponsibility is inconsistent with the very idea of a republican régime.

Under the conditions of a parliamentary system it is impossible for the President to exercise the powers which the Constitution has conferred upon him; and, as a matter of fact, he no longer attempts to do so. No President since McMahon has ever made use of the power to send messages to the Parliament except to express thanks for his election or to announce his resignation. Any other communications would need to be countersigned by a minister, and therefore whatever the President might have to say to the Cham-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

bers would be nothing more than a ministerial declaration. Likewise, the right of the President to demand of the Chambers a reconsideration of measures to which he objects has not been exercised a single time since 1875, and therefore may be regarded as a dead letter.

In the course of the debates on the new military service law of 1905 General Billot, who was strongly opposed to a reduction of the term of military service from three to two years, addressing the Senate, stated that even if the law passed both Chambers, there was still hope of defeating it because the President of the Republic had the power to compel a reconsideration of the law by the Chambers, and the General ventured to express the hope that the President would exercise this power. Thereupon the President of the Senate, M. Fallières, loudly applauded by the Left, interrupted the speaker and informed him that his remarks were out of order and could not be permitted. No member of the Senate, he said, could invoke the authority of the Chief of State against the will of the Chambers; he was entirely irresponsible, and his name could not be pronounced in the course of the debates.

When it was proposed in the National Assembly to give the French executive a veto power similar to that of the President of the United States the proposal was objected to on the ground that, whereas the American President needed it as an arm of defense against the encroachments of the legislative department, the French executive was so strongly armed that he would have no need of it, and to vest him with such a power would give him the preponderating influence in the Government.

One of the most important powers of the President of France—one which is not possessed by the President of any other republic—is the power to dissolve the Chamber of Deputies with the consent of the Senate. It is a power ordinarily belonging to monarchs, and it was strongly opposed in the National Assembly by both moderate and radical republicans as a dangerous weapon in the hands of the President. It was thought, however, to be a necessary part of the parliamentary system, since in case of conflicts between the legislative and the executive powers it could be employed for the purpose of appealing to the nation to decide who was right.

The only instance in which this power has ever been

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

exercised was at the time of the crisis known as the *Seize-Mai,* in 1877, when President McMahon compelled the resignation of a ministry which had the confidence of the Chamber of Deputies and followed it up by a dissolution of the Chamber. The elections which followed returned a republican majority which refused to give its confidence to the ministry of reactionaries which McMahon had constituted, and the republicans, under the lead of Gambetta, demanded that the President should submit or resign. He decided to submit; but a few months later, finding his position intolerable, he resigned; and the Chambers elected a republican who was willing to play an impersonal rôle and allow the Parliament to govern. The circumstances and manner under which the right of dissolution was employed in this instance brought it into great discredit. Legally exercised in form, it was not so in spirit, and was contrary to the principles of the parliamentary régime. Like the other powers of the President, it may now be regarded as a dead letter, and there is little likelihood that another attempt will ever be made to resurrect it.

The practically unlimited power of appointment which the Constitution gives the President has, like his other constitutional prerogatives, passed to the ministry, and so far as he is concerned it is a mere fiction. Nominations, as a matter of form, are laid before him for an approval which he cannot withhold. He may recommend certain candidates to the favorable consideration of the ministry, but he cannot himself choose even a sub-prefect or a justice of the peace. McMahon was often called upon to remove reactionaries whom he desired to retain and to consent to the appointment of republicans who were distasteful to him. Casimir-Perier sometimes read in the newspapers announcements of important appointments which he was supposed to have signed, but which in fact had never been brought to his attention. In regard to the choice of his ministers, or, rather, the chief minister, the President has a little more freedom, for in France the parliamentary system is not perfectly developed, political parties are not well organized or disciplined, and there is rarely a majority with its recognized chiefs whom the nation has in fact designated for its governors. Often in France, therefore, several men have equal claims to leadership; under such circumstances the President may exercise a certain liberty of choice, though

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

this independence has been abridged by the precedent set by Grévy of taking the advice of the presidents of the Chambers and even of the presidents of the various parliamentary groups. Moreover, it was settled at the time of the *Seize-Mai* crisis when McMahon vainly pleaded to be allowed to appoint the ministers of war, marine, and foreign affairs that the power of the President ends with the appointment of the ministerial chief to whom alone the right belongs to select his colleagues.

The method by which the President of the Republic is chosen is likewise partly responsible for the annihilation of his independence. The President of the Republic of 1848 was elected by the people, but the ease with which Napoleon III. employed the plebiscite to overthrow the Republic discredited the system of popular election; and aside from the small group of imperialists it had few advocates in the National Assembly of 1875. It was feared that the system of popular election would make the President too powerful a magistrate, enable him to dominate the legislature, and open the way through appeals to the people for *coups d'état* and dictatorships. Moreover, it was inconsistent with the parliamentary system, and also with the French theory of the arbitral and neutral character of the President. Finally, it would result in the choice of ambitious men of popular gifts who would not consent to play the negative rôle which parliamentary government assigns to the chief executive.

The actual procedure by which the French President is chosen is, when compared with the long and complicated process by which the President of the United States is nominated and elected, a very quiet and simple affair. A month before the expiration of the Presidential term the members of the two Chambers of Parliament are convoked in National Assembly at Versailles, away from the exciting and overawing influences of Paris, and, without nominating speeches or debates, the President is elected by secret ballot. The election is rarely preceded by any announcement of candidacies (the recent election was an exception in this respect), no electioneering, no campaign, and but comparatively little newspaper discussion or manifestation of popular interest. Since the first election of Grévy it has been the custom for the members of the different party groups in Parliament to assemble in their caucuses a few days be-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fore the election and to agree upon the candidates whom they expect to support. Then the groups constituting the republican majority meet in a general caucus and decide upon the candidate for whom they will all give their votes in the National Assembly. The system is not very different from the method by which Presidential candidates in the United States were nominated from 1801 to 1824. In recent years there has been an increasing dissatisfaction with the existing method of electing the French President, which, coupled with the principle of irresponsibility, has reduced the Presidency to a mere dependency of Parliament, and numerous proposals have been made for an enlargement of the electoral body by joining to it other classes of electors; for example, delegates chosen by the councils-general of the departments, or delegates representing such bodies as the academies, universities, chambers of commerce, trade-unions, etc. Even proposals for popular elections have not been lacking, though they have not received serious consideration. The unfortunate experience with the system of popular election under the Republic of 1848 has created in France a distrust, not to say fear, of popularly elected Presidents —a fear from which they are but slowly recovering. Nevertheless, it must be remembered that universal suffrage was a new thing in France in 1848; the voters are more intelligent and independent to-day, and there is no reason to believe that they would abdicate their power into the hands of an Emperor with the same willingness which they showed in 1851.

The history of the French Presidency has not been favorable to the development of a strong executive power. Carnot and Faure died while in office, the former at the hands of an assassin. Four Presidents resigned before the expiration of their terms, Thiers and McMahon being virtually forced out of office by the hostile attitude of Parliament. Grévy's resignation was positively demanded by the Parliament when it was discovered that his son-in-law was using the Elysée as a center for carrying on a scandalous traffic in decorations. Casimir-Perier resigned in disgust after having occupied the office less than six months, giving as a reason his unwillingness to remain in a position in which he was little more than an automaton. Only Loubet and Fallières served out the full terms for which they were elected.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Constitution establishes the principle of re-eligibility, and therefore a President may be re-elected indefinitely. This was a scheme of the monarchial majority in the National Assembly of 1875 to leave the door open for a life President who might use the office as a stepping-stone to the throne. As a matter of fact, only one President (Grévy) has ever been accorded the honor of a re-election, and he was forced to relinquish the office before his second term was well under way. No other Presidents have been candidates for re-election; in fact, all of them since Grévy have either announced in their messages of thanks at the beginning of their terms or made known their intentions in other ways of not seeking a re-election. Indeed, there has been no apparent desire among the Presidents themselves for more than one term. It may, therefore, be asserted that the single-term tradition has become a fixed part of the working Constitution.

A final source of weakness in the Presidential office lies in the character of the men who have been chosen to occupy it. Since Thiers, whose occupancy antedated the adoption of the Constitution, all the Presidents of France, with possibly one or two exceptions, have been men of very mediocre ability and for the most part without force or initiative. All had served a number of years in one or the other of the Chambers, all had held cabinet positions for brief periods (which does not necessarily mean much in France), and three of them—Casimir-Perier, Loubet, and Fallières—had risen to the position of ministerial chiefs. Grévy had served as president of the Chamber of Deputies, while both Loubet and Fallières were presidents of the Senate at the time of their election—a circumstance which it is feared by some may result in the creation of a precedent in favor of the presiding officers of the Upper Chamber.

Heretofore it has been a rule that the President must be a " safe " man—that is, one who is known for his lack of aggressiveness and his readiness to efface himself and leave to Parliament the government of the country. This explains why the really great republican leaders like Dufaure, Gambetta, Jules Ferry, Charles Dupuy, and Waldeck-Rousseau have been passed over for comparatively unknown men from whom the Parliament had nothing to fear.

The issue of McMahon's unfortunate struggle with the Chamber of Deputies, his complete subjection by Parlia-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ment, and his resignation as an escape from an intolerable situation left the Presidency greatly enfeebled in influence and in popular esteem. The Parliament was now determined that the President should play only an impersonal rôle, and it found in Jules Grévy a docile instrument of its will. He had begun his political career in 1848 by demanding the abolition of the Presidential office, and now when he had been called by a singular fortune to fill the office which he had opposed as a useless organ he proceeded to put it in harmony with his early views by effacing himself and resigning his functions to Parliament. He announced in his message of thanks to the Parliament for his election that he proposed to submit strictly to the great law of the parliamentary régime and that he would never oppose the national will as expressed by its constitutional organs. Essentially negative in character, he considered that the duty of the President was to give advice and not to act. The Presidency, he said, afforded an honorable retirement for weary veterans of long political struggles, whose counsels the country needed, and that his position was rather that of a retired Chief Magistrate than that of an active executive. Shutting himself up in his palace, from which he rarely emerged, unknown to and unseen by the people, and apparently indifferent to public affairs, Grévy's official life coincided entirely with his theory of the Presidential office; and when at the end of his nine years of inaction the Parliament demanded his resignation the tradition of Presidential effacement was complete and the constitutional principle was established that, although the term of the President is fixed at seven years, his tenure is practically dependent upon the will of Parliament.

Casimir-Perier was by temperament and habit a man of action, and to some extent he possessed masterful qualities. He belonged to a distinguished family and possessed a classical education. Like McMahon, he desired to have a personal policy and play an active rôle as President of the Republic, but he soon found that his position was one of impotence and without influence. His ministers often did not seek his advice nor even inform him of the decisions which they had taken in his name. In a few months his position became intolerable, and, refusing to be longer treated as a valet of the Parliament and ministers, he resigned an office to which it was impossible for a man of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

his character to adapt himself. He would probably have made a good prime minister, but he was unfitted to play the inactive rôle of President of the Republic. He took his duties as President rather more seriously than other French Presidents have done, and he announced at the time of his election that it was not his intention to neglect the exercise of the powers that the Constitution had conferred upon him. Other Presidents have given similar assurances, but they have all been unable to make good their promises. In his letter of resignation Casimir-Perier declared that the President was deprived of all means of action and of control without which his moral influence was nothing, and that he was condemned to a position of impuissance. Years afterward, in 1905, he wrote a letter to the *Temps* in which he described the rôle of the President as it actually is under the régime of irresponsibility. The President, he said, can do nothing except through his ministers; he must attach his name to whatever the ministers lay before him, and hence the record of his official acts is nothing but an autograph collection. Among the powers which are conferred upon the President by the Constitution, he concluded, there is only one that he can exercise personally and with freedom from ministerial control—namely, the right to preside at national solemnities. Carnot and Faure were both popular Presidents, both traveled much, showed themselves to the people, took part in the national fêtes, delivered discourses, and represented the country in its relation with other powers in a dignified and creditable manner, but neither added anything to the power and influence of the office.

Essentially the same thing may be said of Loubet and Fallières. Both were descended from peasant stock, both had long and honorable though not brilliant parliamentary careers, and both rose to the Presidency of the Senate. They were both excellent types of the kind of men we have come to expect the Parliament to choose as Presidents. Both willingly effaced themselves and played an impersonal rôle. Loubet, in his message of thanks to the Parliament for his election, described the President as an " arbiter " who must listen to the advice and counsels of Parliament before taking any step involving the supreme interests of the nation; Fallières at his first cabinet meeting outlined the negative rôle which he played throughout his term: " I shall advise

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

you," he said, "and at times criticize, but there will be no Elysée policy." And there was not.

Such is the President of France to-day. "The less we say of him," says Professor Moreau, one of the most distinguished writers on French public law, "the better; he is a pompous, expensive, and perfectly useless functionary. The parliamentary system has literally deprived him of all authority and reduced him to the position of a mere signer of papers of the contents of which he is often ignorant." "He is," continues Professor Moreau, "a mere dummy, a *soliveau* dressed sometimes in a royal mantle, sometimes in a black suit; but always he is a nullity, almost ridiculous, incapable of action, without any will of his own, condemned to parade at public ceremonies and to exhibit himself from afar to the people." Other French writers have described him as a "useless machine which costs money but produces nothing," an "emaciated shadow of a *roi fainèant,*" a "phantom," a "king without a crown," etc. His time is occupied chiefly in attending cabinet meetings at which he is largely a silent spectator, in approving acts which he cannot disapprove, in traveling about France and occasionally abroad, in giving receptions, dinners, and balls, in opening expositions of many kinds from dog shows to the annual *Salon,* and in giving "chases" several times a week in honor of prominent political men and distinguished visitors. J. J. Weiss, a well-known French writer, parodizing Thiers's definition of the rôle of a constitutional king, once remarked that "the fundamental principle of the Constitution is or ought to be that the President chases rabbits and does not govern," to which M. Leyret adds the opinion that a President who does not hunt rabbits would be disesteemed in France.

To many Frenchmen such an office is useless and without *raison d'être.* There may be some excuse, they say, for a hereditary figurehead, because royalty exerts a certain influence not without value upon the masses, and even upon the Government itself, but an elective figurehead commands no such respect. For a long time the abolition of the Presidency was regularly inscribed on the programmes of the Radical party, Clemenceau being one of its chief advocates, though of late the party seems to have abandoned its early hostility. Since 1902 it has been vigorously demanded by the Socialists. In the National Assembly of 1894, which

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

elected Casimir-Perier, a member demanded recognition to present a motion for the suppression of the Presidency, and he was loudly applauded by the extreme Left, but his proposal was declared out of order. In the same year Goblet, chief of the Radical party, proposed a constitutional amendment for this purpose.

Whatever may be the merits of the question, there is no doubt that the office could be abolished to-morrow without serious inconvenience if only some provision were made for the appointment of the ministers. This function might be intrusted to a special delegation chosen by Parliament, as has been proposed. The vast majority of Frenchmen, however, do not desire the abolition of the Presidency; they feel that there is a real place in the state organism for a chief executive even though the office is little more than a "magistracy of influence" and the occupant only a *surveillant générale*, as Prevost-Paradol once described the Presidential function. Many thinking Frenchmen are of the opinion that if stronger men were elected they would at least be able to exert an effective moral influence upon the government of the country and serve as a "guide to the nation"—one of the three rôles which Woodrow Wilson attributes to the President of the United States. While this is not unlikely, it is difficult to see how the President of France can ever exercise any real political authority until the present attitude of the Parliament toward the executive has been modified. It has refused to regard the President as a collaborator or to recognize the executive organ as a co-ordinate department. It has insisted upon controlling his acts; it has reduced him to submission whenever there has been a conflict between the two departments; and those who refused to submit have been forced to abandon the Presidential office. Moreover, the legislative department has not been content with keeping in its own hands the government of the country, but it has largely usurped the right of administration, interfering in the execution of the laws and dictating appointments to office, so that it may now be truthfully said that the Parliament of France legislates, governs, controls, and administers. Monsieur Faguet, of the French Academy, observes that never has a nation been more completely governed by its legislature than has France since 1871. And the legislature has shown no disposition to surrender one particle of the authority that it has

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

usurped; indeed, all the signs indicate that a further extension of its sphere of control may be expected.

In electing M. Poincaré President since the above was written, the National Assembly has broken the custom heretofore followed of choosing only respectable and obscure politicians. He is the strong man of France to-day and the only real statesman and leader to reach the Elysée since Thiers's retirement in 1873. He is a distinguished scholar, orator, and lawyer, and his conduct of the foreign policy of France during the past year has been characterized by a high order of statesmanship which has won for him wide popularity at home and general respect abroad. Unquestionably the feeling is spreading in France that the President should be allowed to exercise more real power in the government of the country, and, now that a man of action and leadership has been elected in whom France has entire confidence, the opinion is being expressed that he will not be content to be a mere master of ceremonies. Until, however, there has been a radical change in the existing attitude of Parliament toward the President it is difficult to see how even M. Poincaré, strong man as he is, can play anything more than the ceremonial rôle just described.

James W. Garner.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

TRUST REGULATION

THE SOLUTION

BY ALBERT FINK

III

As no disease can be successfully treated until properly diagnosed, no ailment to the body politic can be adequately dealt with before its cause and nature shall have been fully understood. To this end a brief examination of the causes of the present political unrest becomes necessary. It is believed that any analysis of the indictment against modern civilization, or, as the Socialists are pleased to call it, the "Capitalistic System," will result in a demonstration that the fundamental evil complained of is the unequal division of labor and its fruits. Said Adam Smith in his opening paragraph of *The Wealth of Nations:*

> "The annual labor of every nation is the fund which originally supplies it with all the necessaries and conveniences of life which it annually consumes and which consist always either in the immediate produce of that labor or in what is purchased with that produce from other nations."

The objection is not that the "necessaries and conveniences of life" purchased with the produce of the annual labor of the nation are inadequate to its legitimate consumption. On the contrary, it is commonly believed that the sum total of the prosperity of our people is equal to, if it does not exceed, that of any other. The complaint is that these necessaries and conveniences are not equitably distributed, that under our industrial system the "Capitalistic Class" receive more and Labor less than each is legitimately entitled to expect, and inasmuch as the price of all commodities, labor included, is measured in money, the fundamental basis of complaint is that there is an unjust division of this commodity. Too much individual wealth, too much

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

poverty. That this is an evil very justly to be complained of no one may doubt. It is world old. That the equalization of property exercises an influence on political society was clearly understood even by some of the old legislators. Aristotle said:

"*Poverty is the parent of revolution and crime.* In the opinion of some, the regulation of property is the chief point of all, that being the question upon which *all revolutions turn.*"

That the foregoing diagnosis, the unequal distribution of wealth, is the principal cause of the present unrest a moment's reflection will demonstrate. Government ownership of insurance is advocated to prevent the use of enormous accumulations of capital in the further acquisition of individual wealth. Government ownership of railroads, telegraph and telephone systems, State and municipal ownership of gas, water, power, and transportation are contended for not because it is believed that they can be administered more economically or efficiently (in fact, the contrary is frankly admitted), but solely because it is believed that by taking from the "Capitalistic Class" what are said to be the instrumentalities of the accumulation of wealth the result will be its more equal distribution. Though often veiled, the same underlying motive may be easily traced in almost every species of political agitation occurring during the last decade. "Capital too powerfully controls our courts," it is said; "it secures unjust decisions in its own favor." Hence the recall of judges. *The Class Privilege,* as it is called, "has seized upon all the machinery of our government; they control our conventions and prevent nomination of honest men." Hence the direct primaries. "So corrupt have become our legislatures through the malign influence of the power of money we can no longer secure just and wholesome laws." The initiative and referendum is the result. The objection to further combination has its tap root deep in the same soil. Few thoughtful people either believe or affirm that combinations, no matter how large, are *mala in se.* On the contrary, it is well known that they are not only useful, but essential requirements of modern civilization. If they could be more universally owned by the public at large there would be no legitimate objection. The opposition comes from the dread that by reason of exploitation through the tightening of their grip upon government, the trusts will further accelerate the acquisition of individual

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

wealth and its attendant poverty of the masses. Thus every attack upon existing conditions, as well as every suggested remedy, is predicted upon the dread of further concentration. Even the proposed Commodity Court, with power to fix maximum prices for trust-controlled commodities, has its origin in the feeling, at least on the part of some of its advocates, that further exploitations will thus be curtailed and the accumulation of private fortunes made less facile. If now the ultimate cause of the unrest is the concentration of wealth in the hands of individuals, what is the reason of this unequal distribution? Obviously no remedy for the disease can be intelligently suggested until its cause is understood.

The primary factor of the concentration of wealth which suggests itself to the thoughtful observer is the natural and inherent inequality of man. That man is and ought to be politically equal, free, and independent, no one will deny. That man is, in fact, equal either mentally, morally, or physically, no one will assert. By one of the inevitable laws of nature, inflexible in its operation, only the fittest survive. As in war, government, science, art, and the professions the ablest claim the highest prize, so in finance, commerce, and industry, where the ultimate goal is wealth, the greatest reward comes to him who is most fit. How can it be otherwise? If ability be unequal, must not he who is possessed of the greatest skill win in any game of life which the ingenuity of man may devise?

The factor, second in importance to the natural inequality of man, is the very foundation stone upon which our government is constructed—*individual liberty*. When this country first cast off its allegiance to Great Britain and became an independent member of the family of nations all that was thought necessary in government was *personal freedom*. Man had just come to realize that by natural law he was and ought to be free and independent. It is true that such a conception had in a desultory manner existed in the mother country since the days of Magna Charta, but its application had been spasmodic and confined more to the landed aristocracy and great barons than to the people at large. It was theoretic rather than actual. On the Continent it was unknown.

With this principle in mind the "Fathers" constructed a government whose ideal was individual liberty. If only

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mankind could secure and retain that which it had never had—*personal freedom*—all would be well, it was thought. No longer were there to be castes. There was to be no aristocracy other than that of merit, no orders of nobility other than those of worth. Every man was to be free to rise just as high as his native talents would permit in any field he might choose to enter. What he might lawfully acquire was his to dispose of as he willed, nor was it to be taken from him except for some public purpose and then only upon just compensation. It was a noble conception nobly executed. Recognizing that the organic law they were framing might not prove in all respects adaptable and expedient to the purposes of the generations yet to come, a constitutional method was incorporated for its amendment. But individual freedom, the right to aspire, to climb to any summit, to hold, dispose of and acquire property without limit is but the rule of *unrestricted competition*. Unequal men, unrestricted competition for the necessaries and conveniences of life; could there be but one result? It has often been said that the great inventions, improved transportation facilities, combinations, have been the great factors in the concentration of wealth, but this is not a correct statement of the case. That the great inventions have enormously increased the labor efficiency of the country, which translated into money means greater wealth for acquisition, may be admitted. Rapid and cheap transportation have made available additional markets and combinations have rendered attainable that which would otherwise have been impossible. But all these conditions have been at all times open to every one. *There has been equal opportunity for all.* So it is said that the banking system, the unlimited credits, the manipulation of the money of others, has been an important factor. Here, too, each has had equal opportunity, and if one was able to secure a greater credit and hire larger sums it was because he was able to inspire his fellow-man with greater confidence. These conditions have but widened the field of operation. They have been instruments equally available to all. The fundamental cause lies deeper—*unrestricted competition between unequal men.*

Paradoxical as it may seem, it is nevertheless true that the great industrial trusts and combinations of capital have fed and grown fat upon that which was designed to destroy them, the rule of free and unrestricted competition. Two

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

great competing carriers engaged in a death struggle for freight and passenger traffic, two or more individuals or corporations occupied in an effort to undersell, and thus secure the markets of a rival, present much more the appearance of contending armies bent on mutual extermination than gentle handmaids distributing the products of labor. In war, though one conquer and the other be vanquished, the net result is waste to both. Yet in the national Congress, the State legislatures, on the stump and from the press has been heard the cry: "Let competition be free and untrammeled! Whatever restricts competition restrains trade. Each is necessary to the onward march of civilization." The error is fatal and must of necessity result in the very conditions which are now deemed so objectionable. It was the relentless struggle between competing carriers to secure more than their just proportions of business which enabled the industrial corporations to impose upon the former that system of rebates which in turn enabled the latter to undersell all competitors in any given market and thus force them to abandon the field. So far from being one of the essentials, unrestricted competition is one of the great obstacles, in spite of which civilization yet moves on. As no rational human being would employ two engines to perform a function which could with equal efficiency and economy be obtained from one, so no one can successfully contend for any true economy in a system which encourages two or more groups of men to perform those labors which can with equal efficiency be performed by one. Wherever a surplus is found engaged in any field of industry over and above that required for economic production and distribution there is to that extent waste of human energy. Were this proposition not self-evident, no more convincing proof of its inherent truth would be needed than a casual comparison of the prosperity of the carriers to-day as compared with their condition prior to the time when a wholesome enforcement of the law by an Interstate Commerce Commission forbade discriminatory rates and rebates, thus rendering unnecessary those violent rate wars which proved so disastrous. In other words, the restriction of a theretofore unbridled competition.

It is not to be assumed that competition is without its place in economics, for, as pointed out in a previous article, it forms a very necessary balance-wheel to commerce, pre-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

venting, as it does, any excessive or extortionate charge by monopoly and insuring a superior article at a minimum price. But it is the right to compete rather than the actual competition itself which preserves the desired equilibrium. So long as the former exists there is no cause for alarm at the absence of the latter. All that is necessary is to preserve the right itself intact; self-interest, the natural laws of trade, supply and demand, will do the rest. But though the right is thus useful by reason of its moral effect, it by no means follows that there must be legislative enactment for its actual employment. There is no sanction in the true science of economics for government command, "Still must you trample, crush, corrupt, and kill!" If, then, the cause of the political social unrest be the concentration and unequal distribution of the products of labor, *wealth,* and if this condition be the inevitable result of a free and unrestricted competition between unequal men or groups of men, *personal liberty,* what is the solution? As the primary cause, the natural inequality of man, can in no wise be remedied by legislation, we come at once to the consideration of the secondary factor—individual freedom—to acquire, hold, and dispose of property without limit and without restraint. Are the American people now prepared to curtail that personal freedom, individual liberty, which has been so eagerly sought after by the master minds of all ages and which heretofore has been so universally thought essential to the welfare and development of mankind? It would indeed seem a pity. The period of absolute personal individual freedom has as yet been of such short duration, by comparison with the long ages of servitude and oppression, that the mind revolts at an experiment so radical in its nature until every other possible solution has been tried and found unavailing.

If, however, the nation is now ready for this fundamental change, the remedy is simple. A constitutional amendment, for such it must be, authorizing a graduated and unlimited Income and Inheritance Tax, followed by Congressional legislation establishing a scale which will confiscate in its operation all incomes after they have reached a certain agreed-upon figure, will simply and surely accomplish the purpose, and limit the further acquisition of individual wealth beyond a certain definite standard. But surely there must be some middle ground, which, while preserving that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

personal freedom and independence so much to be desired and conserving all the great stimulants and motives for individual initiative and effort, will nevertheless, by rendering concentration of wealth more difficult, sufficiently curb the centripetal forces of modern society. If these forces can but be stayed in their baneful operation there need be no particular concern for those colossal fortunes which have already been amassed. Rarely has the second generation held intact the acquisitions of the first, to say nothing of adding thereto, and in the absence of entailment the undesirable conditions of to-day will soon pass away in the ever-shifting sands of human industry. The purpose of the nation, then, should be the utmost conservation of human energy, to the end that in the world's competition the purchasing power of our own labor will reach its highest efficiency, thus creating a maximum surplus profit the more equal distribution of which is desired. *No more useless and unnecessary waste. Let us have no two men performing the labor of one.* The enactment of such laws as will render individual accumulation more difficult, though placing no prohibition or limit upon the reward of individual effort and initiative.

First and foremost, the further immigration of foreign labor should for a definite period be altogether prohibited. Not only have we at present all the foreign elements which the nation can conveniently assimilate with any degree of safety for the perpetuation of the American type and characteristics, but the continued influx bears too heavily upon our own labor and is one of the chief factors in preventing a more equitable adjustment of the differences between labor and capital. As our manufacturing industries have been built up by a protective tariff, so our labor, by prohibition of further immigration and the consequent limitation of the supply, should be given an opportunity for recuperation and readjustment, thus placing it in a position to exact a more equitable wage, shorter hours, and better working conditions. With a limitation of supply there will be a corresponding increase in demand. The attitude of our country in the past upon this important question, saying, as it has, to the afflicted and oppressed of all nations, "Here you may come and by your individual effort better your condition," has been a noble one, but in our effort to benefit mankind we must not jeopardize our own preservation, for

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with the overthrow of popular government in America would vanish the last hope of the world.

Next in importance would seem to be an absolute and utter severance of "big business" from government. Though there has been a marked improvement in this respect in the last few years, there is ample room for more. Of this point the people of the United States have become most justly jealous and will brook no further interference with their will. To this end any use of corporate funds by their officers or trustees for political purposes should by law be made embezzlement. Individual campaign contributions should be limited in amount and published prior to the election to which they are devoted, any violation of the law being punished as a felony. Above all, tampering with or corruption of the administration of justice, the enactment of laws, or the granting of public franchises, should be more severely dealt with than at present. To this end the criminal procedure should be so amended as to prevent unnecessary delays. After the introduction of all its other evidence in chief, the prosecution should have the right to call the defendant to the stand for the purpose of cross-examination upon the whole case, and in this connection the right to compel the production of all papers and documents. The constitutional prohibitions against compelling one to bear witness against himself had its first origin in the inhibition of physical torture as a means of eliciting confessions. The reason for the rule having long since become obsolete, the rule itself has served all useful purposes and should be abandoned. The instances are rare indeed when an innocent man can be kept from taking the stand in his own behalf and society has no interest in protecting the guilty. The penalty for perjury should be largely increased. Eight-to-four verdicts in criminal cases should be sufficient to convict. Ample protection is given a defendant in the right of the court to grant new trials for any miscarriage of justice. An appeal should be allowed government upon all questions of law. The rule against a conviction based upon the uncorroborated testimony of an accomplice should be relaxed in cases where the latter has been neither given nor promised immunity. The parole system should be generally adopted and more liberally applied to first offenders who upon full confession indicate sincere repentance. In all criminal prosecutions the process of one State court should

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

run to all others for the purpose of compelling the attendance of witnesses.

Direct primaries and the short ballot are steps in the right direction. The executive and administrative officers of the State governments should be appointed by the Governor and confirmed by the State legislatures to the end that responsibility may be more definitely fixed. There is no objection in principle to a preferential presidential primary, though it would seem a useless cost and will tend probably more or less strongly to the disruption of parties. Nor is there any inherent objection to the direct election of United States Senators. The question was much debated in the convention that framed our Constitution, and opinion upon the whole was very evenly divided. With these changes in our present system and an already strong current of healthy public sentiment in the same direction, it is believed that the combination between "big business" and government so bitterly complained of will soon be a matter of history.

The State courts should be lifted to the same dignity now enjoyed by those of the nation. To this end the compensation of the judges should be increased to an extent sufficient to attract the ablest lawyers in the profession. The plan would prove economical in the end. The judges should be appointed by the Governor upon the nomination of the bar of their respective counties and confirmed by the legislature. They should hold office during good behavior and be subject to removal only upon impeachment for improper conduct. Their recall by popular will is violative of every principle of a republican form of government. They should be subject to retirement upon full pay by the Governor upon petition of a majority of the members of their respective bars when they have reached a prescribed age. The Supreme Court of the nation should have jurisdiction to review by *certiorari* any judgment of the Supreme Court of a State interpreting the Federal Constitution in like manner as it now reviews the judgments of the several Circuit Courts of Appeal.

Child labor in all its forms and phases should be strictly prohibited and the inhibition rigidly enforced. Women should be given the ballot. It is theirs by natural right and their further disfranchisement can be justified by no pretense. Their influence upon politics will be helpful. If

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

they do not desire it, they should nevertheless be compelled to assume their just proportion of the burdens of government. They will soon appreciate the wisdom of the policy. Their employment in the trades should be most jealously guarded and discouraged as far as compatible with their individual liberty. Their place is in the home, not the factory. Education should be compulsory and the laws in this respect strictly enforced. A child reared in ignorance is a menace to the community. And it is upon the ultimate education of the masses that the destiny of the nation depends. More liberal working-men's compensation acts should be passed and each industry compelled to bear the expenses of its accidents and casualties, in the form of an immediate indemnity to the employee and a continuing pension to him or his dependents. That a human being should be thrown upon the scrap-heap and his dependents left helpless as soon as he becomes injured and unfit for further service is intolerable, even though his death or injury be the result of his own inadvertent carelessness.

There should be a national as well as State graduated income and inheritance tax. This tax, while not confiscatory in its operation, should materially increase with the increase of income, to the end of not only raising a large revenue for public use, but enforcing upon every one a payment according to his real interest in government. If government permits man to acquire and hold property without limit, the recipients of this bounty should be willing to pay in an increased ratio according to the benefits derived. Those who are unwilling should be compelled. Such a tax would not only obviate the necessity of raising a revenue from tariff upon articles which are no longer in the need of protection, but would directly tend to the more equal distribution of wealth by relieving the poorer classes of a taxation they can ill afford and placing the burden where it justly belongs, upon those who have the largest interest at stake. The more a man receives, the more he should be willing to give, and as the tax would never absorb the entire income the incentive to individual initiative and effort would remain unimpaired. There will be no lack of opportunity for profitable and wise investment of the increased revenues resulting from such tax. The conservation of moisture and the consequent redemption of the great arid regions of the West, the reclamation of swamp and overflow lands, the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

further improvement of rivers and harbors, the acquisition of telegraph and telephone systems, a more efficient navy and State militia, together with many other useful and necessary products, will easily absorb all the available revenues. So there should be established a system of national pensions in addition to those already paid survivors of our wars. Not only should every employee of government, who by reason of his age or ill health has lost his efficiency, be subject to retirement upon a livable pension, but every citizen of the country who has become old and decrepit and is no longer able to adequately care for himself, is a direct charge upon the nation and should be the recipient of its bounty. Such a system, in addition to the imperative demands of morality, decency, and justice, has the further advantage of directly tending in a most legitimate manner to the more equal distribution of wealth by taking from those who can well afford and giving to those who are in the sorest need.

Unpopular as the suggestion will no doubt prove, and notwithstanding the deep suspicion with which it will be viewed, nevertheless the Sherman Anti-Trust Act should be forthwith repealed. As pointed out, it is wrong in principle, unnecessary for the purpose for which it was invoked, and has brought about the very conditions which it was designed to hinder. It is without place in sound economics. Its net result is the waste of human energy, and by commanding the eternal warfare " of each against all " the inevitable consequences of its operative effect is to destroy that which it was calculated to conserve. In its place should be enacted such a Federal Incorporation Law as will compel not only all the great industrials, but also all others who are engaged in interstate commerce, to abandon their State charters and accept in lieu thereof those offered by the National Government. Space will not admit any detailed discussion of the separate provisions of this law. Suffice it here to say that two at least of its underlying principles should be a maximum amount of publicity as to all corporate manipulation, including the actual physical valuation of the property and assets back of securities and a complete and absolute prohibition under severe penalties of any ownership of the stock or security of other corporations. The ownership by one corporation of the stock control of another is wholly unnecessary for any of the legitimate purposes of commerce

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and has conduced as much as, if not more than, any other one factor in corporate management, to the centralization and unequal distribution of power in the hands of individuals. The incalculable benefits which would be derived from such legislation will be readily observed.

Inasmuch as some of the foregoing suggestions are clearly without the present powers of the Federal Congress and the adoption of others would be attended with grave constitutional doubt, there should be assembled a convention under the Fifth Article of the Constitution for the purpose of proposing amendments. Since the adoption of our organic law, nearly a century and a quarter ago, there has been no such assembly. Such convention would no doubt be attended by the best and ablest that the nation can produce. If the same wise veil of secrecy as was adopted by the Fathers in the draft of the original instrument were thrown over its deliberations until its conclusions were reduced to final form, there can be little doubt that many able and wise suggestions would be made and adopted. In any event, the time has clearly arrived when the nation should again take counsel in the solemn deliberate and conservative manner pointed out by the Constitution itself.

Above all, there should be that spirit of toleration for the views of others and willingness for just compromise without which so little can ever be accomplished. Labor should ever remember that "He tires betimes who spurs too fast betimes," that great and permanent reforms are not the product of a day and often not even of a generation, that in any ultimate clash of force victory will not necessarily lie with a disorganized numerical majority, powerful as it may appear, and that the overthrow of the great principle of "equal opportunity for all" might in the end, as it has done in the past ages, bear most heavily upon the masses. Capital, on the other hand, or individual wealth, should remember that "Whom the gods wish to destroy they first make mad," that they have a large stake in a government which permits unlimited competition and acquisition between unequal men, and that conditions which produce such unbounded individual wealth in the midst of such squalor, poverty, and human misery in a land where the total products of labor are far beyond the required necessaries and conveniences of life, are not only morally unjust, but *wholly intolerable.*

ALBERT FINK.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE CASCADE

BY LOUISE MORGAN SILL

For centuries, gray olden centuries have I flung
Myself o'er this abyss, and rung
  The challenge of my music on the rocks.
  Ancient I am, yet can withstand the shocks
Of seasons bitter and sweet, and the corroding years
  Pass over me as harmless as the clouds
That add their passing tears
  To my swift torrent. And though I am so old,
So old that trees of mighty strength have died,
  And warm-blooded men grown cold,
Father and son and grandchild, and the bride,
The wife, the widow; conquerors, kings, and slaves;
  Dynasties and the prophecies of sages,
  Tomes of philosophers—the toil of ages—
Brimming with man's insistent thought that rolls
  From cycle to cycle, changing as the year,
  Fashioning life anew as needs appear,—
Yea, though all these have passed,
Yet I through age-long watches keep my tryst
With God's command, and down the mountain's height
My flood of foam and crystal liquid cast.

For I am old and sure; I know my way
Through Alpine wildernesses where no foot
  May tread, nor chamois dare a rushing leap.
  I know not rest, nor the strong lure of sleep,
But here eternally I charm the stars,
  And in my caverns deep
Sing madrigals that none may hear and live,
For who would follow my mid-earthly flight
Must die in an unending night.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I am the testimony of the Law.
I witness Things unseen.
Who looks on me must know that God hath been,
And is, and ever shall be. For I saw
  The wonders of great deeds . . . and man must feel,
When over me he leans, that influence,
Secret and holy; and, when he goes hence
  Back to the world of men whose trouble steals
His peace away, his thoughts will turn to me
  In my green solitude, and soul to soul
We shall commune till Spirit, pure and free,
  Shall have its way his sorrow to console—
As if a Hand, by father-feeling led,
Had drifted down from Heaven upon his head.

LOUISE MORGAN SILL.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BERGSON:

A CRITICISM OF HIS PHILOSOPHY

BY C. DELISLE BURNS

It is always ungracious to attack a great man. The critic may be regarded as a prejudiced opponent of anything new when he refuses to admit that the statements of an original genius are true, for men are so eager to be in the forefront of progress that they are not ready to believe that what is new may be also false. And yet when the world is taken by storm at the appearance of a brilliant and attractive writer some criticism must be offered. If it is a case of literary criticism the critic may be expected to be cautious, for only the experience of some years, perhaps of some generations, can be sufficient ground for the approval or condemnation of an artist. But the case of a scientist is different. We demand from him at once the complete verification of his statements; and we are rightly governed by our received and admitted knowledge until he can prove either that that knowledge is false or that his new doctrine does not contradict it.

Bergson may be criticized as a biologist or as a physicist, but it is as a philosopher that I propose to criticize him here. He has advanced views both as to the *method* and as to the *results* of philosophy which would transform, if not destroy, most of what is now believed in philosophy to be true; and, although there is no reason why he should not be right and all former philosophers wrong, we cannot admit so startling a proposition until, at least, he has made his own system seem more consistent.

The philosopher is one who is concerned with the discussion of what is "real." He is to tell us whether or not color, for example, is as "real" as "substance," whether the table of our ordinary sight is the "real" table, and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

so on; and since we cannot believe him without reasons, he must show us at least by what method he has arrived at his conclusions. Thus I put aside in this criticism of Bergson his discussion of Instinct or his psychological doctrine as to the different intensity of states of mind. I am concerned primarily with the general view that he takes of the world in which we live and of ourselves. He says, in effect, that it and we are not what we seem to be, and he says, further, what we are. And again he says that he has discovered what we are and what the world is by a process called "intuition."

Now as to the method which Bergson calls intuitive, it is, in the first place, distinguished from the logical process of reasoning. For whereas reasoning involves a looking back upon what has occurred, and, therefore, implies that the subject-matter is past and dead, intuition is an entering into the flux of life, a giving ourselves over to the impulse or stream which is reality. Thus reasoning cannot grasp life, and intuition can; and since life is the only reality, intuition alone can give us a view of reality. Reasoning describes the dead body when life is flown; it touches only the outer shell of things.

The vast body of our science and history has been built up by reasoning, and therefore we do not find in such knowledge anything but a superficial view of the real world or of our real selves. To say that this view is superficial implies that some other and deeper view is possible, as Bergson indeed deliberately states. The deeper view is that obtained in *intuition*.

But what in fact is this intuition? Bergson, the psychologist, has described it admirably, but Bergson, the philosopher, seems to have valued it wrongly. For, to put it plainly, this Bergsonian intuition, if it can be separated from reasoning at all, is only the bare *awareness of fact* out of which reasoning takes its rise. Bergson says that intuition takes us a step above reasoning, but from all his argument and metaphor one concludes that it really takes us a step below. Intuition is described as an entering into the current of life, as a non-analytical appreciation of the undivided flow of life or consciousness; and, of course, in so far as life is really one process and not a mechanical addition of parts, we "understand" it better when we appreciate it as one. But in the first place reasoning does not

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

deny the unity of that which it may for special purposes divide or analyze, and in the next place life is not understood at all if it is supposed to be a homogeneous flow of activity. It is not our purpose here to defend real reasoning against Bergson. It is sufficient to say that the reasoning he describes is a mere shadow of the process which has built up science and history. He has taken the scaffolding for the building. He misrepresents reasoning, and then, naturally, condemns it. But let that pass. The "intuition" which he exalts by contrast with reasoning is what must be criticized here, for not only is it a philosophical mistake to value it as Bergson does, it is also a most pernicious doctrine to preach such admiration for it.

We should not hold a philosopher responsible for those who adopt his doctrine, but we may, perhaps, understand the tendency of his doctrine by observing the use which may be made of it. The Syndicalists claim that Bergson expresses their view of social movements. And how? In his doctrine of intuition they find precisely that justification of blind, unreasoned violence which will destroy but need not build up. We are told that we must not ask for mere "reasons" why the "general strike" or the destruction of the present social order should be advocated. "Reason" is too mean a thing. "Intuition" indicates that the flow of life must do away with the forms in which life is now expressed, and therefore we must give ourselves over to the destructive force. This may, of course, be a misrepresentation of Bergson's teaching, and he has given us so far no pronouncement on ethical or social problems, but it shows how readily the attack on reason and the exaltation of intuition may be made to support what is, in plain prose, a return to savagery.

Bergsonian "intuition" is very much welcomed by all who want to be saved the trouble of thinking, and by all who desire to justify by disdain their entire ignorance of science or history. It is an easy and comforting doctrine that what you lack is not worth having, that the long labor of the scientist or the historian gives him no greater knowledge of the "real" world than any fool can have who indulges in a momentary "intuition"; but if that is so it makes Bergson's work as useless as that of the most analytical philosopher and puts us back for truth to the barest and more primitive vision of reality which precedes all sci-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ence and all history. Bergson himself is aware of this dilemma. He knows that to decry reasoning too much might well result in the refusal to read his books, for " intuition " by his own confession he cannot give, and, in fact, reasoning of some sort is the best he has to offer. Therefore, he is insistent that he is *not opposed* to science. He even goes so far as to say that the scientist has a *higher* intuition of reality than the ordinary man; but he is not consistent. He seems to imply that the scientist has this higher knowledge by some other process than his reasoning, and yet his *reasoning* is all that distinguishes him from the ordinary man.

In fact, Bergson seems to have made the old mistake of taking the two *elements* of one thing for two different *kinds* of things. What he calls " reasoning " and what he calls " Intuition " are really two elements in *one process*, which process is that by which we understand reality. To divide the process is to kill it, as to suppose that man consists of two separate and independent entities, body and spirit, is to make the understanding of what man is an impossibility. The whole may be analyzed; it cannot be divided and yet remain the same. The parts may be distinguished, but if considered as distinct they remain unintelligible. Thus man may be considered now as body and now as spirit, but body without spirit is nothing and spirit without body is nothing. And thus, in Bergson's use of the words, " intuition " without " reasoning " is nothing and " reasoning " without " intuition " is nothing. Thus also the more reasoning the more real intuition; and this is why the scientist and the historian have a truer view of the real world than the ordinary man has.

What, indeed, is Bergson's own personal " intuition," in so far as it has given him that grasp of real development and of life which has been his best contribution to modern thought? That intuition is itself nothing but the very life-blood of his scientific reasoning; it is that which he has developed in the laborious process of thought in the *Creative Evolution*. And to separate the process of thought from the insight which is in a sense a component part of it is to misrepresent the whole situation. The intuition which Bergson describes, if it is not the mere awareness of fact, is the insight of the scientist and the reasoning philosopher. If I may quote a modern novel, Mr. H. G. Wells has described precisely this attitude and insight in his *Marriage*.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"In these particular directions [in scientific thought] the human mind has achieved a new and higher quality of attitude and gesture, a veracity, self-detachment, and self-abnegating vigor of criticism that tend to spread out and must ultimately spread out to every other human affair."

So much may be said as regards Bergson's *method*, and now I turn to the *result*. What view has he reached of the real world? What has resulted from the application of this method to the evidence of experience? The result is variously described as an appreciation of the growth or development of the world or as the perception of an "*élan*" which cannot be described in scientific language.

Now, it is undeniable that philosophy should indicate the fundamental truth of change, growth, and development; but this is not specially new. Hegel certainly thought that he had expressed the nature of reality as development; and, though we may justly quarrel with his statement, the meaning of Herbert Spencer was the same. Bergson, however, neglecting Hegel and Heracleitus, the philosophers of change, conceives himself to have stated the true nature of that reality which changes. Again, I shall not discuss his psychology, although I cannot avoid acknowledging here the excellence of Bergson's remarks on the continuity of mental process. He has put an end to the old atomism of ideas and mental states and shown us consciousness as a whole.

But in his philosophy he has a different problem to encounter. It may be that life, or even conscious life, is a "stream," but is the whole of reality or are all the things we call real only phases in this stream? Bergson seems to say that they are, and if that is what he means he is wrong. For in the first place, and from the old idealist point of view, Bergson has not explained how "matter" or material things are parts of the stream. He calls his philosophy "Creative Evolution" and he sets out to show that all that is is only modification of one initial impulse. But in the development of that impulse, in explaining how the impulse goes now in this direction, now in that, how it becomes now a man, now a flower, he brings in a brute matter which *does not originate in the initial impulse*. That is to say, matter acts on life in developing it, but matter itself does not develop. Therefore, the world as a whole is not developing, and the whole cannot be "Creative Evolution."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The increate, resisting, negative "matter" is there before the evolution begins to create.

And yet in some sentences of the *Creative Evolution* Bergson seems to imply that matter itself is the same impulse, but turned in a direction opposing that of life. There is then no brute, negative, immobile "thing"; but all is impulse, all is force moving either forward or backward. Now, whatever be the intention of these metaphors, we must be careful. A philosopher should not substitute metaphor for argument. That is the art of the special pleader, not of the candid investigator of facts. And when I come to ask what it means to say that the table and the stone, as well as myself and Bergson, are all modifications of "one reality" I cannot find any answer. I know that such a question is as much leveled at the old idealism as at Bergson; and indeed I confess that, except for beauty of language and skill of metaphor, I do not find anything very different in the doctrine of Bergson's "*élan*" and Hegel's "Absolute." But the ordinary man of common sense feels, and correctly feels, as I think, with those philosophers who object to a hasty assimilation of all the variety of the world and the reduction of all "real things" to a porridge or a soup which is called "impulse" or "Absolute." For to say that the infinite variety of things is all illusion or the result of a merely practical view of life is not to explain; it is to explain away the problem.

Bergson seems to believe that the distinction we make between things is a result of a subjective desire to do something; and so, of course, it must be, since all our thought is "for the sake of life." But Bergson seems to mean more than this. He seems to imply that the distinctions *do not give us reality* and that the only reality is an indistinct and continuous flux. And yet surely if, having made the distinction between things, the things are then usable and comprehensible, there must be something *in* the things which gives us a valid ground for making our distinctions. This surely means that the distinction between things is there independently of us; that is to say, *reality is plural.*

I shall not labor the point; but in this the ordinary man sees with the realist philosopher, for he thinks the table "real" and himself "real," and he does not, therefore, suppose that he and the table are made of the same stuff. For "real" means "existing," and does not imply any

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

material or substance which alone *is*. The table exists and the thinking man exists and many other things exist, but they retain each its distinction from every other.

What Bergson has given us in his flux or "*élan*" is a poetic phrase such as is Shelley's when he calls a lark a "blithe spirit." The lark remains for ornithology a bird, as the world remains for the philosopher a complex of different real things; and, although the value of the metaphor is undeniable, it should not be made the basis for a view of the universe. The poet with the inspiration of the moment sees the world in a new and not altogether false light, but it is the light of a mood or of a temperament; it is not the light of universal truth.

It will be seen, then, that I rank Bergson among the poets. At least as a literary man his position is unassailable and his work will live, as Nietzsche will live or Plotinus; but although the boundaries of philosophy and poetry are in dispute, it is clear that the philosopher must depend upon intellectual and the poet upon emotional sympathy. If any distinction can be made—and I confess Bergson may say it cannot—the philosopher should give us a consistent view of the universe which is applicable in our normal moments. The poet appeals to us by transforming our life into some exceptional ecstasy. As a philosopher, therefore, Bergson fails, but as a poet he may prove to be valuable to us and to generations yet unborn.

C. Delisle Burns.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE VIRGINIANS AND CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT

BY THOMAS NELSON PAGE

When Thackeray put his finishing-touch to the portrait of Esmond—the character which he is said to have loved the best of all his creation—the finest gentleman, perhaps, ever painted, he sent him overseas at last, to spend the evening of his life in Virginia. And later, in his sequel to that novel—almost the only successful sequel to a novel of first rank ever written, he throws his portrait on the screen in a fine sentence which sets the blood to tingling. It is in the scene in *The Virginians*, when young Harry Warrington returns to England and becomes a guest in the house of Lord Castlewood, whose title had rightfully belonged to his grandfather, Colonel Esmond, of Virginia. The Baroness Bernstein—once the beautiful Beatrix Esmond, was in the company, and she directed young Warrington's attention to the portrait of Colonel Esmond, hanging on the Castlewood wall, and spoke of him warmly, as well she might. None can forget the scene when Colonel Esmond, rode down to Castlewood after Beatrix's lover, and finding him to be Prince James himself, for whom he was imperiling his life, broke his sword and turned his back on him.

Now with Esmond in his grave in Virginia, Beatrix pointed Warrington to his portrait on the Castlewood wall and spoke her admiration which had come too late. To give it in Thackeray's own words:

> "The Virginian? What's he good for? I always thought he was good for nothing but to cultivate tobacco and my grandmother," says my Lord, laughing. She struck her hand on the table with an energy that made the glasses dance. "I say he was the best of you all."

Virginia was the oldest of the American colonies. She extended once from the French colonies along the St. Law-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rence far toward the Spanish colonies of Florida. Inland, she stretched to the furthest sea and she took in all islands along the coast. Later, New England was cut off from her territory; yet later, Maryland and the Middle States and part of the Carolinas were taken from her. In a great crisis she gave up to the Union the Northwest Territory, and Kentucky likewise; and finally West Virginia was cut from her remaining territory.

Virginia is scarcely a territorial term—at least not simply this. Like the term, "The South," she is only in part territorial; in part, she is a state of mind. She is in the hearts of her sons and her sons' sons, if they be loyal to her principles, wherever they go, and she has sent them forth filled with her spirit so long and so far that she is greater to-day than when she bordered the Great Lakes to the northward, and to the eastward, took in the isles of the sea.

Was this spirit in any way distinctive; and if so whence got it this distinction? What were its sources? What its scope? What its direction and effect? The answer to all is—Patriotism.

And first of its distinction. Can any one believe that it was a mere accident that Washington and the men who surrounded him and made this country what it became—giving it its peculiar frame and form of government and stamping in its Constitution the essence of Liberty, were Virginians? Can any one believe it was an accident that Washington and Jefferson; Henry and Mason; the Randolphs; the Lees; Thomas Nelson; Cary; Edmund Pendleton; the Harrisons; and a score of others—their equals in virtue and patriotism and force, if less noted, all appeared in the same region, in the same crisis? Can we believe that it was mere chance that Madison, Monroe, Marshall, Wythe, Lewis, Giles and Herndon, and a score more of their kind followed hard on the heels of the others, all from the same workshop? Was it mere fortune that Henry Clay and Winfield Scott, Zachary Taylor, and Benjamin Harrison; Rives and Tyler all sprang together from the same soil? Or coming on down a generation, was it an accident that Lee and Stonewall Jackson, and Joseph E. Johnston, and J. E. B. Stuart, and Matthew Fontaine Maury, all came from Virginia, together with a not inconsiderable fraction of that soldiery, who according to some high authorities were the most notable fighting force that the world has ever known?

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Was it mere chance that in that little corner of the world which we call Greece,—but which was only a part of Greece —during the Periclean age, such light burst forth that it has continued to shine throughout the world from that day to this, and has given mankind ever since, the models of beauty in its indestructible forms of liberty and of classic art? Or when Rome suddenly evolved, in a few short generations, law and order from the previous chaos of Barbarism, and gave us the models of virtue whom Plutarch has left in his immortal pages—Was that chance?

To hold this, would indeed be to offer on the altar of Fortune, the rich sacrifice of Reason. There must be some firmer ground than this for all these extraordinary developments. When a new star shines, it does not come by chance; but in accordance with laws, and when a galaxy shall appear, there too, the light is poured in obedience to laws often so silent in their operation as to be known only through their effects; but none the less laws.

In Virginia, in one chamber of an old country house were born two signers of the Declaration of Independence, and General Robert E. Lee—while from within little more than a day's ride of that mansion, came five Presidents of the United States, with Washington at their head. Chancellor Wythe, signer of the Declaration of Independence as he was, is probably hardly known to the present generation save as a name and a vague memory. Yet in his day he was so highly esteemed, even among those contemporaries whose names are known the world over, that men eagerly sought the privilege of placing their sons in his law-office or under his charge. Among his pupils were four young men: Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, John Marshall, and Henry Clay. Now, could it have been a mere freak of fortune, that those four young men were pupils of the simple Virginia Chancellor—or did, sitting at the feet of that Gamaliel, have some bearing on the development and future destinies of the author of the Declaration of Independence; of the father of the Constitution; of the great Chief Justice, and of the great Commoner, Henry Clay?

And now let us pass to the consideration of the influences that produced such a result.

To summarize them: The people of Virginia were originally almost purely English or Scotch, into which came later, a small infusion of Huguenot and a larger infusion of Scotch-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Irish—all of sterling stock. The element of transported persons, of which so much has been attempted to be made of late by some, was so small as to be negligible. The Virginians were composed of a strong and adventurous element of the people from whence they came, and the weak among them perished in the "seasoning," leaving only the stronger and more vigorous portion. They possessed and brought over with them the firm belief of the English in representative government and individual liberty, as conquered by their forefathers in the old country and guaranteed to them in their charters. They believed absolutely in the tenets of the Christian religion as held in England; they believed in the administration of the law as practised there, and in the liberties of the people as achieved and maintained there. They did not believe in these fundamentals half-heartedly; but believed in them with all their heart and soul. For their beliefs they were ever ready to fight, and at need to die.

The conditions in the New Country broadened and strengthened them immeasurably. Facing the wilderness and the savage, the feeble acquired strength; the timid acquired courage. The fittest survived. The frontier life gave them strength, courage, endurance, breadth, and independence. It was a stern school and they either learned its lessons or perished. In the organization of their society every man was a soldier; most men were rulers over some part of the earth. As they evinced ability, wisdom, and thrift, they were admitted to take part in the government. If they obtained wealth it was spent in enlarging the things over which they ruled, and this increased their responsibilities; strengthened their fiber and broadened their scope. Money, as such, they cared little for, and they were equally ready to borrow or lend it—if they had it. At least, they spent it and never amassed it.

The life tended to reflection, and the reflection was directed mainly to matters of government—to the relation between man and men. Liberty was their passion. Thus, they became trained political philosophers, as steeped in the theories of government as the Athenians of Plato's day. And thus, when the great exigencies came at the time of the Revolution and afterward, Virginia was full of men who could, at an hour's notice, propound and debate the basic principles of government, with a knowledge and an insight

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

never excelled in any period known to history. The pole-star of their lives was Liberty: Liberty as defined in their charters: Liberty as conceived in their enlarged minds. For all the rest they cared not.

They set up an elective representative Assembly before any other colony had landed on American shores. When James undertook to subvert their liberties and vacate their charters, they refused to give up their books to the King's Commissioners, and when the Clerk of their Assembly gave up copies, they stood him in the pillory and clipped his ear. In the religious war that was waged in England, they sided with the Crown and Episcopacy. They offered a kingdom to the exiled Charles. "Whole for Monarchy," wrote of them one at this time. Virginia was always whole for everything she was for at all. She so withstood Cromwell's ships that they were fain to make a treaty with her, as if she had been an independent power. Yet, when later Charles invaded her rights and granted the "Northern Neck" to his favorites —Culpeper and Arlington, she flamed—and when Sir William Berkeley refused to commission her leaders to defend her borders against Indian ravages, she burst into revolution with Nat Bacon, the rebel, at her head. The gallant young leader died, and the revolution was quenched in blood by Sir William Berkeley—in so much blood that Charles removed the doughty old Governor, with the fleer that the old fool had "hanged more men in that naked country for his little Rebellion," than he himself had hanged for the murder of his father. But though suppressed, the seeds of liberty remained alive, and a hundred years after, the Revolution came again; the Royal Governors in Virginia and the other Colonies as well, were driven out and Liberty was the reward.

When the Stamp Act was put into execution, Virginia was ready for the work in hand, her leaders trained: Patrick Henry, of Hanover, a County Court lawyer, wrote on the fly-leaf of a copy of Coke—upon—Littleton, which he had in his saddle-bags, and which constituted a considerable fraction of his Law Library, his famous resolutions. They were debated at Williamsburg with an ability which would not have been excelled in Westminster Hall. Later on, George Mason, a Virginia planter, drew the Virginia Bill of Rights, esteemed by some the greatest of State papers, and the Resolutions in the Virginia Convention, under which her dele-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gates, in the Continental Congress, were instructed to act and declare the Colonies Free and Independent States, were offered by Thomas Nelson, a young planter, and were seconded and debated by Pendleton and Henry. And acting in pursuance of their instruction, Richard Henry Lee, who offered the Resolution in Congress, was first chosen, and in his absence, Thomas Jefferson drafted the Declaration of Independence. They were all capable of doing it. The only question was, who could do it best.

Posterity has rendered its verdict and declared with John Adams, that the best man to do it was the Virginian, Thomas Jefferson, the most elegant pen in America—the man who as a youth had declared of Henry that he "spoke, as Homer wrote."

So it was in the generations that followed, even down to the time of our war. In every crisis, Virginians were among the leaders. The Virginia idea was ever apparent if not prevalent. It crossed the mountains to Kentucky; it crossed the rivers to Ohio and what was termed, the West. Lincoln and Grant were the product of this transmission.

Now why was this? What were the principles which gave them this abiding quality of leadership?

Allusion has already been made to some of the causes. I think that the others resolve themselves into the fact that they were founded on the basic virtues of both public and domestic life. On this anvil was forged the character that produced Constitutional Liberty in this land.

The writer asked once a great New Englander what he considered the chief distinguishing trait of the Puritan Fathers, and he answered, "Their Character." It was a wise answer. Their sense of duty to God was the foundation of the Puritan's character. God-fearing men who lived as in the sight of God and strove to obey what they understood to be His law, grew, of necessity, to be men who feared none else and naught else.

Yet my New England friend was wholly wrong in one assumption. He knew New England but not Virginia, nor the rest of the country. He thought that this firm character and the cause of its setting in such form, were the sole possession of the Puritans. This appears to have been long the general impression.

Until just now, there has been an apparent impression which somehow became quite general out of the South, that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nearly everything that has counted for much in the history of this country, either sprang from or took its color from New England. Much of the history which has been written of later years, teaches this—inferentially, perhaps; but quite distinctly.

For example, the New England Puritans have been declared by those who have undertaken to set up as teachers, to have been the only section of the population inspired by high ethical principles. While, on the other hand, the population of the South, particularly of Virginia, have been assumed to have been a roystering, hell-raking lot of adventurers who, ready enough maybe to fight in any cause, good or bad, yet wanted the essential principle of serious character, from which alone great achievement could spring. As I have elsewhere pointed out, no characterization could be further from the truth. The precious prize of Constitutional Liberty, which our fathers so largely secured and transmitted to us, could have been won only by long suffering, goodness, righteousness, and truth—by the fruits of the Spirit. A tree is known by its fruits.

Now what shall we do to preserve the precious heritage left us? Over a century and a quarter has gone by since our forefathers, by their character, created a new Nation, and founded it forever on the principles of liberty. The little nation which they created has spread, until it numbers nearly one hundred million people. It covers nearly a whole continent and its influences have extended to every shore of Christendom.

The conditions that have arisen are so novel that the thoughtful man is often called to consider whether our fathers could have contemplated such strange conditions, and whether their governmental theories are well adapted to the solution of the new questions which have arisen.

Where they had poverty, we have wealth, beyond the dreams of avarice and even of the imagination; where they had weakness, we have power—a wealth and power that is affecting the entire civilization of the world.

We see new conditions springing up about us on all sides and the question is how shall we adapt ourselves to them? It behooves all thoughtful men to consider with all their powers the steps which we shall take in the solution of these vital problems which confront us.

Out of our wealth and power have sprung the greatest

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dangers to our welfare as a people, as is the history of all republics. Well may we pray, as in the old Liturgy, "In all times of our tribulation and in all times of our wealth, Good Lord, deliver us." The road by which republics rise is the road of self-denial and unselfishness; the road by which republics fall is the road of ease and personal indulgence. These are the perils which sap the forces of freemen.

I do not believe that we as a people or a nation are going to ruin; because I believe that there is enough patriotism and high principle—enough character left in our people to preserve us, at need, in every extremity. When a great moral principle is involved they can be counted on. But there is even now enough peril to cause a grave disquietude among thoughtful men. We have approached a point from which many republics have hastened to decay. We have attained to conditions which sap character and weaken the forces of a people. We have reached a point where we are reckoned by the outside world as among the wealthiest, if not the wealthiest of the nations of the earth; but also as the most commercial-minded people of the earth and, possibly, as the most selfish. We are charged with having less regard for the common principles of commercial honor and less reverence for law, than any other people. Are these charges true? Have they any foundation whatever to rest on? If they are true, even measurably true, then it behooves every man in America to pause and consider how we may so rectify our conduct, private and national, as to relieve us from the stigma, and once more recover the old foundation of upright conduct and righteous dealing. Never at any period of her history, has the country needed the aid and devotion of her sons more. That eternal vigilance is the price of liberty is an eternal truth, and it is never more true than, when lapped in luxurious ease, we begin to dream that the established order must always prevail. "Is not this great Babylon that I have builded?" exclaimed the mightiest monarch of the earth. But that night God weighed him and finding him wanting cast him by and Darius the Median took the kingdom.

We have problems to solve, of which our forefathers in their furthest vision of the future, never dreamed.

All sorts of problems—new problems, are before us. Race problems, economic problems, governmental problems. For years Virginia and the rest of the South have faced one

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the greatest race problems that has existed in the World. A problem which in some form has dominated the course of this country for a hundred years. Its influence is not confined to the South alone, for it permeates the whole course of our national life. At length it has appeared to be settled, at least it has been relegated to the background by other problems more pressing. But it is not settled, it is there, and it will require all the courage, all the patience, and all the wisdom of all the people to settle it, or even to control it along proper lines of moderation, justice, and righteousness. Other race problems, hardly less imminent and important, have come up of late years, mainly in other parts of the country than the South, yet their influence also, like that of the Southern race problem, reaches in every direction to the farthest confines of the country and affects the vital spirit of this Government.

Besides these race problems there are internal problems which are influencing beyond compute, the spirit of our people and affecting the very structure of our government. Among these problems is one which may be said to have its central office in our great metropolitan city. It is the great economic problem of the acquirement, application, and control of Wealth. This problem permeates the very being of this Government, and like the others, it stares us in the face with a challenge for its solution which will not be silenced. The problem of wealth is no new problem. A profound student of government has said that, "The two great perils to ancient Democracy were Ignorance and Wealth." As you always have the poor with you, so you always have the rich with you; but the problem of wealth beyond the dream of avarice, gained through the manipulation of governmental machinery, so that it finally controls the operation of the government, is at least sufficiently new in our own country to be still regarded with reasonable surprise and alarm. Every man of sense must recognize the fact that wealth cannot be equalized, and every thoughtful man equally recognizes the fact that there are limits beyond which wealth cannot be properly acquired or held for private or selfish ends.

This problem is new, at least in its aspect of a governmental problem. There was, as I have said, wealth in past periods of the Government; but men then used their wealth for the country, and they did not use the country to amass

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

riches and pile them up only to acquire more riches. Why, there are men to-day who, through using the country, using the organization of the governmental machinery for their private ends, have engrossed in their hands riches beyond compute. They refer this condition to power of organization. The power of organization is a priceless gift, but when its possessors appraise it at hundreds of millions the people begin to think. They know who pay for it.

But not content with possessing all this wealth, they have employed it in subsidizing the public machinery of government to amass more. They or some of them have, in some parts of the land, secured control of the representatives of the people in their legislative assemblies; they have even dared to reach out and lay their unholy hands, at times, on the sacred tribunals of justice, until a grave question has arisen whether the people will longer abide by the present system of representative government—that is, in plain language, whether they will trust their own representatives and their own judges. It is no longer a question of mere property, of mere wealth. It has come to be a question that reaches to the foundations of our government—to be the question: Shall this Government endure? A committee of Congress, which has been investigating the matter, has, according to the reports in the press, stated that, through a vast system of interlocking directorates—a few men, with a sort of central office in one great city, control some forty billions of the property-values of this country—that is, about half of the wealth of this nation. They control the great railways; the great steamship lines; the great coal-fields; all the great semi-public arteries of the country.

At the head of this mighty system of property control are but a few men—fewer perhaps than two hundred. They have their personal virtues—they are men of standing in every city of the land—they are large givers—of late very large givers—though they give only to a small number what they sap from the hearts of all. But they are a privileged class, and Democracy cannot tolerate a privileged class save as character and other personal endowments exalt one man above another.

This great system of interlocking directorates, with its Briarian arms, is strangling the old ideas on which this Government is founded. Does any one outside of that coterie believe that the people will stand this much longer?

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

They will not. The peril is that in their determination to overthrow this system of greed and avarice—this system of tampering with our governmental machinery, they may destroy the principles themselves on which this government rests—the principle of the independence of the judiciary, and possibly the principle of representative government itself. Owing to the action of that privileged class, both are imperiled now.

Formerly the men of wealth, holding high position, were scrupulous in all matters that related to the public, and held themselves as representatives, and in some sort as trustees of the public. Could even flattery say that these later representatives of vast wealth have been scrupulous in their dealing with the public? What is the general judgment of Wall Street throughout the country? We know that these men are for the most part scrupulous in their private dealings with each other; we know that on the stock-boards, millions of dollars pass by the wave of the hand, often without so much as the scratch of a pen. Millions are the counters in their game! But who pays for these millions which so pass? The public. Who pays for the million-dollar houses which they build, and for the four-hundred-thousand-dollar pictures with which they furnish them? The public. And they pay it none the less that the money is drained from them without their knowledge, as the blood flows, all unknown, from internal wounds until the wounded man drops. Can we think, as these good gentlemen appear to think, that the people are going to stand this forever? The people are becoming informed, and when they are fully informed, no one knows what may happen. There are other revolutions than those which blossom with barricades and blush with the blood-red flags of anarchy. There is a revolution now in progress, and though, please God, it will not come to a revolution of barricades, no one can tell quite what the end will be. The whole system of representative government may be revolutionized by it.

If Wall Street be the beneficent agency which these gentlemen who conduct matters there hold it to be, then they should enlighten the people. If, on the other hand, it be what the people hold it to be, then these gentlemen who conduct it should mend their ways. Before Heaven! I sometimes wonder that these men, when they commemorate, at their Belshazzar feasts, the Babylon which they have built, do not

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hear sometimes, in the pauses, the sound of the picks of the ditchers digging under their walls.

Of diplomacy, the same view is taken that is taken in other commercial matters by these captains of finance. The diplomacy which once was so ably represented by the Virginians: Jefferson, Monroe, Marshall, Clay, James Barbour, Andrew Stevenson, and by the great men of other States—by Benjamin Franklin, John Jay, Morris, the Adamses, three generations of them; by Gallatin, the Pinckneys; by Buchanan, Phelps, Bayard, and Lowell; what is it called now? It has come to be called "dollar diplomacy." And what is the result of it? That on this continent we are the most universally hated people between the two Poles; that across the seas we are held in what often appears to be little less than detestation. I recognize the fact that it is of great importance that we should extend our markets throughout the world. But I feel that it is of greater importance that we should make it clear throughout the world that this Republic stands for liberty, for amity, for justice.

"Dollar diplomacy" is but a poor substitute for that diplomacy which made the seas safe for American ships; which has delimited the boundaries of our country and saved, through the patience, the patriotism, the far-sightedness, and the wisdom of that great Virginian, Henry Clay, the Great Northwest; which helped to bring into being, the Republics of the South-American Continent and bound them to us in friendship through generations, until the modern diplomacy alienated them and turned their affection into hate. Have we gained by the exchange? Go to South America and ask. Go north to Canada and inquire. The old diplomacy which looked to friendship as its basis and its object has given place to a diplomacy formulated to suit the fancy of conductors of finance. If an Ambassador or Minister does not suit them, a little trip is taken to Washington and out goes a minister; in goes a new one more satisfactory to them. Has any question ever been raised that these ambassadors who have thus been given their congé were not acceptable to the countries to which they were accredited, or were failing in any respect to perform their duties faithfully? No! It has been simply a question of dollar diplomacy.

This sort of thing is not likely to last; but it may last long enough to widen the breach between us and other nations until we shall stand alone in what a noted, but short-sighted

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

statesman of England once spoke of as "splendid isolation." No isolation is splendid any more.

The one way to solve these problems is along the lines which our fathers blazed for us; by putting the public good before private interests; by consecrating ourselves soul and body to this great end: the service of the commonwealth.

For, most disquieting of all our perils, to those who have studied the history of government and known how difficult, laborious, and slow has been the growth of liberty, how delicate and fragile is the strongest republic, how easily it is injured, and how insensibly it sinks into decay, is the tendency on the part of the people to yield to change: their readiness to applaud whatever promises a new order. It has taken generations—yes, centuries of suffering and aspiration to secure the liberty which we enjoy; generations of our forefathers fought and suffered and died to leave us this birthright. And we are in danger of selling it—for what? For a mess of that same red pottage for which liberty has ever been bartered.

Now, what is the principal gift which our fathers have left to us, wherever we may be, intrusted with the responsibility of preserving their teachings? The prime gift with which they have blessed us is liberty. All agree as to that. The prime gift of Virginia and the old States to their sons was not wealth, nor the capacity to obtain wealth, though many of them have it in full measure. The gift was liberty. Our fathers, so far from reckoning wealth as the chief aim of life, placed it far down in the scale. They possessed wealth prior to the two great revolutions which have swept over the country, in which they were the leaders. They were the wealthiest class on this continent, possibly in the world, yet they sacrificed it without hesitation to secure liberty. When George Mason of Gunston Hall wrote that if he could leave as a patrimony to his children a crust of bread with liberty, he would be content, he was using no mere idle phrase. He and his like, the great landowners of the South, threw all into the scale for liberty. And so they did in the later Revolution.

They left us not only liberty; but they left us a chart by which to maintain that supreme blessing which God bestows on His people. They left us a government and a Constitution—complex, it is true, but so arranged that it can be reasonably, lawfully, and wisely adjusted to meet

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

whatever situation may arise. They left us, as the fundamental principle of that government and that Constitution, the principle of representation. The one new principle which they struck out and handed down to us is representative government as applied to a republic. All the rest had been tried. This alone was their new creation which distinguished this Republic from all other Governments then existent on the earth or which had been existent in times past.

If one wishes to fortify his arguments from the armory of experience and reason, all he has to do is to study the debates, which grew out of the Constitutional Convention, by which the Constitution of the United States was ordained. If he wishes an illustration of its value, of the imperative and supreme value of our Constitution, all he has to do is to study the history of jurisprudence covering the period, extending from the time of the war, to the close of the period of Reconstruction in the South. As the United States of America came into being through the adoption of the Constitution of the United States, so, through the protection afforded by the Constitution of the United States, the State of Virginia, together with the other Southern States, owed her preservation, as did the people of those States. By the Constitution they were preserved from a destruction, the like of which has not been known on the earth, since the Constitution of the United States was adopted.

Now we are told that this is all outworn. That the methods of procedure provided by the Constitution are antiquated and inefficient, and that the methods of amending the Constitution and meeting the new conditions are outworn and unequal to the occasion. We are told that under this very palladium of our liberties the people have been trodden down, their representatives have been debauched, legislation has been corrupted, and the Bench itself has become the hired enginery of the enemies of the people. We have been told that a New Nationalism has come into existence, and that not only all the old methods, the old procedure, but the principles themselves, for the exercise of which they were provided, are antiquated, outworn, and antagonistic to the principles which called them into being.

But one name is given to all who will not subscribe to this new teaching; but one name is provided for all who do subscribe thereto. Neither name is in the least distinctive,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

neither name contains the slightest suggestion of the aims, of the motives, the ends, or the principles of the adherents of those who espouse the one side or the other. All who oppose the New Nationalism, whether they be old "stand-patters" who have stood as the bulwark of privilege, or whether they be the sane, sound, reasonable defenders of the rights of the Constitution, and of the rights of the people against privilege—have been classed together in this new vocabulary, as Reactionaries; while those who would pull down the entire structure of Government about our ears, whether they be the most eager advocates of centralization of unlimited power, or whether they be the most arrogant representatives of trusts in the land, are classed together as Progressives. At need, they take up the wildest theories that have ever been propounded, and if there be a wilder one propounded to-morrow, they will be prompt to adopt that likewise. Whoever does not subscribe to their views is told that he has no confidence in the people.

Whence came this sudden revulsion; this strange and unlooked-for uprising against that which every generation of Americans to the present time has been ready to die for? It comes from two classes and from two classes alone. The one that small class, which, availing itself of the opportunities that have been presented, have sequestered in their hands, if not all the power, at least an undue proportion of the power in this country, whether it be the power vested in organization or whether it be the power incident to material wealth. The class which, having its central office in one of the great centers of this country, has, through its selfishness, its arrogance, its assurance, its ability, monopolized in its hands a great part of that which belongs of right to the public, that is, to the people—the class who have covered it up with the guise of law, and under the guise of law, are pursuing their selfish and perilous ends.

The other class is a large one. It is not selfish like the first; but it is more ignorant. It is a class which largely has been admitted to this country within our own generation. It has not had time yet to become fully steeped in the spirit of this free land. Unused to freedom, it has a tendency to break over the line that divides freedom from license. It is readily played upon, especially by designing leaders who rise out of their own body. It has the excuse which the other class has not, that it has found it necessary to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

organize, and organize in very narrow ways, for self-preservation. Unaccustomed to power, where it has found itself possessed of power, it has been unable to use it with moderation. Thus, with their energies directed in other lines than those which lead to the contemplation of the principles of this government, they have been led in a direction hostile to the old forms under which this government has achieved its success. They have seen with a clear vision, as the rest of us have seen, that the first class to which I have referred have monopolized in their hands the wealth and the rights of the people, and they have seen that they have done this under the color of the law. They have seen the greatest examples of their rapacity upheld in instances by courts subservient to their power, and in the first flush of indignation at this betrayal of what they recognize as their rights they have been led to denounce not only its particular acts of coercion and rapacity—not only the agents guilty of these particular acts, but the whole system under which these agents and their agencies have come into being. It is not unnatural that they should take this view of the case.

But what may be natural enough to an element new to our country, unversed in its history, ignorant of its traditions, knowing only the pinch of present conditions as they exist in regions which have unhappily fallen under the dominance of the selfish monopolistic class, would be most unnatural in those Americans who are the heirs of all the traditions which brought this Government into being out of the maelstrom of revolution, who have inherited with our blood the knowledge of what constitutional government has been able to accomplish, even in the short period in which it has had its exercise. On us rests a responsibility which we can never evade, of applying every energy with which God has endowed us to preserve constitutional government and adapt it to present needs. If faults which may be mended discover themselves in a great structure, do we cast it down in order to remedy them? If the roof leaks, do we pull the walls down and tear up the foundations and turn the place into a wilderness? Had our fathers taken this view, we should never have been the free country which we are, and those who are now assailing the integrity of our institutions would never have found an asylum where they would have liberty of speech, liberty of conscience, and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

liberty of action. Liberty would have perished at its birth and freedom would never have been known.

The fundamental principles on which this Government is founded have been attacked by these new doctrinaires, who have substituted for those foundations of living rock, the ever-shifting sands of popular expediency. One of their chief points of attack is the independence of the judiciary. The great Virginia Convention of 1829–30 was a body which contained possibly as much intellect and wisdom as any assemblage ever gathered together in this land, or for that matter in any land under the sun. It included, among other great men, James Madison; James Monroe; John Marshall; Littleton Waller Tazewell; Philip Pendleton Barbour; John Randolph of Roanoke; Chapman Johnson; John Tyler; William B. Giles; Alexander Campbell; and Benjamin Watkins Leigh.

In that Convention all these questions relating to government were discussed and considered by the ablest men of their day. Among these questions was that of the tenure of office of the judiciary. The question might have appeared a local one, confined to Virginia alone; but the discussion, as ever, in that body went down to the basic principles of government for all time. In this discussion, the independence of the judiciary as a fundamental principle of all government was assumed, and the debate was only as to the best method of securing that independence. When the debate upon the tenure of office of the judiciary was drawing to an end an old man arose, whose name is received with veneration wherever the principles of Justice are known, and made an appeal for the absolute independence of the judiciary from every influence, even the most indirect. His name was John Marshall and he closed his argument in these words, referring to the Judges of every court:

> "If they may be removed at pleasure, will any lawyer of distinction come upon your Bench? No, sir! I have always thought, from my earliest youth till now, that the greatest scourge that an angry Heaven ever inflicted upon an ungrateful and a sinning people, was an ignorant, a corrupt, or a dependent judiciary. Will you draw down this curse upon Virginia? Our ancestors thought so, we thought so until very lately, and I trust that the vote of this day will show that we think so still."

The vote upon the resolution under consideration touching the independent tenure of office of the judiciary of Virginia proved overwhelmingly that the Virginians of that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

day did think so still. Are we profounder students of the science of government than they were? Have any new conditions arisen which require the tearing up of the foundations of this Government? Is our population better able to supersede *en masse* their freely chosen and selected representatives, selected because of their assumed knowledge, character, sympathy, and experience, subject to their direction and responsible to them for re-election at short intervals? If not, then let us remedy such defects as may become apparent; but let us not destroy the whole fabric of our Government.

We have seen within a very brief time a return to power of a party which proclaims itself and has a right to proclaim itself the party of government by the people, the party of democracy—as opposed to the party of privilege. For the first time in more than a generation a man of Virginia birth, of Southern rearing, and of experience covering both the South and the North, and therefore of a knowledge of the conditions of both sections, has been elected President of the United States, Chief Magistrate of this Nation. He is the leader of the democracy, neither of the progressive wing of that democracy, nor of the conservative wing; but leader of the whole of the democracy—leader for the first time, of a united democracy—standing out boldly, courageously for the preservation and maintenance of the rights of the people—clearly bound by their direction, to preserve all that has been tried and found true in the experience of this Government heretofore, and to discard whatever has been found impracticable and unsound, in that period. To his aid, he has the right to summon all the wisdom and all the experience of his party; nay, all the wisdom, all the experience of every party, for when he shall have taken his oath of office, he will become President, not of any wing of a party, not of any one party; but of all parties and of all the people of the United States, and his oath of office will be to protect the Constitution of the United States, and faithfully perform the duties of the President.

So far as may be seen and foretold at this time, no stronger character has been called to the Chief Magistracy of the nation in its history, or one who, on his entrance upon his duties has given promise of being more independent of improper influences or more devoted to the fundamental principles of the Republic. A profound student of compara-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tive politics from his youth, deeply read in the science of government, on which he has been a thoughtful commentator; absolutely familiar with the history of this country, he brings to the exercise of his exalted office as great promise of soundness of view, loftiness of purpose, and steadfastness of principle as any man has done since the days of Washington. It has been the custom of late years for the fraction of the people of this country, intrenched by privilege which they have paid for of the people's money, and which has been secured to them by that payment, to proclaim with wearisome insistence that the triumph of democracy meant the overturning of everything in our life worth holding on to; that in its train would follow panic and poverty and destruction of all that our fathers revered. They have proclaimed that the reduction of the expenses of the united establishments of the army and the navy would bring disaster in its train; that commerce would be imperiled and business be destroyed. They have been more than puzzled by the quiet, dignified, self-contained attitude of him who has been called to the leadership of the democracy. Where he has spoken, he has laid down principles with clearness and confidence. No clamor has moved him to announce his intentions in the details of his administration. Like Grant, he has listened and been silent, as to his proposed appointments. Like Jefferson, when he has spoken, it is to declare only the soundest principles of governmental policy. Without undertaking to press the parallel too far, for the natural change of conditions ever prevents historic parallels being absolute, there is a somewhat singular resemblance in the situation now to the situation when Jefferson was called by the democracy to assume the reins of government. There was the same overthrow of the party of centralization, the same jeremiads issued incessantly from the adherents of that party, the same forecast of absolute overthrow and destruction. Let us see what a thoughtful student and historian of that time has said of it:

"No class or region or single school of politicians or thinkers could keep the mastery or determine the course of such a people, growing after such a fashion, on such a continent. Democracy, free force, an equal footing for all men in opinion, effort, and attainment were the very conditions of its being: there could be no leading-strings. Mr. Jefferson spoke the spirit of the day, its only acceptable principle in affairs. The Government had passed into the people's party."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Its programme, as Mr. Jefferson spoke it, accorded with its origin: The restriction of Federal powers within straight constitutional limits, an unembarrassed field for the powers of local self-government within the several States, the payment of the public debt, the reduction of the armed forces of the country, and consequently of the taxes, to the lowest practicable point, and as nearly as might be free trade at the ports: a government simple, inexpensive, unmeddlesome. Some of the latest and most partisan acts of the Federalists in the new Congress, with its working majority of Republicans, proceeded to undo. . . . The Federalist Naturalization Law of June, 1798, which required a residence of fourteen years as a condition precedent to the acquisition of citizenship by a foreigner, was repealed, and the old period of five years restored.

"But there the reaction stopped. The new Congress reduced the Federal taxes and the customs duties at the ports; cut down the army and navy establishments; retrenched expenses and lessened burdens, as had been promised and expected; but the despondent forebodings of those Federalists who had looked to see a fatal retrogression in the character of the government were not fulfilled. The people's men were not, after all, 'Jacobins and miscreants,' and Mr. Cabot was apparently not yet justified in considering 'democracy to be the government of the worst.' Mr. Jefferson called Mr. Madison to the Secretaryship of the State, a man whom all the country knew to be a patriot and a statesman. He made Albert Gallatin, of Pennsylvania, Secretary of the Treasury, and financiers soon learned to trust the clear-headed Swiss for judgment and capacity almost as much as they had trusted Mr. Hamilton himself. There was, at any rate, no revolution in the business methods of the government.

"Mr. Jefferson was too wise a politician to alienate the very men whose suffrages had brought him into office. He knew that many thoughtful men who had before always voted with the Federalists had in the last election voted for the Democratic-Republican electors—not because ready to see the government experimented with, but because they hated the taxes with which the Federalist Congress loaded them, disliked the new tone and temper of the Federalist leaders, and believed that, for all they were so radical in their talk, the leaders of the opposition would simplify the government without weakening it or doing it damage. He knew that he was on trial to prove his conservatism as well as to prove his capacity for reform. He meant to prove himself no enemy of an efficient Federal government, but only an enemy of extremes.

"It turned out that he had judged the temper of the country and the posture of affairs to a nicety, and had brought in a new régime which was to give its opponents abundant time to assess its qualities. Mr. Jefferson remained eight years in office; and handed on the Presidency to men of his own school of political principle, who kept it for sixteen years more." *

Thus has spoken the present head of the democracy, in whose hands have been reposed by the democracy the responsibilities of the *administration of the Presidency.*

* *History of the American People* by Woodrow Wilson, vol. iii., pp. 173-4, 176-8.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

On us devolve the responsibilities of upholding his hands in whatever relates to the perpetuation of this Government and the welfare of the people. On us will devolve equally the responsibility of withstanding, no matter by whom advocated, whatever tends to impair the foundations of this Government and injure the people. I do not know how we may accomplish this better than by consecrating ourselves anew to the principle to which our fathers consecrated themselves —to the principle that patriotism is above place; that liberty is above wealth or power, and that whatever tends to imperil liberty is at war with patriotism and with liberty.

Old Virginia is doing her part in the new movement. She has of late years been coming to the fore and resuming her position of primacy in the National Counsels.

Happily, the moral sense of the people of the country is beginning to be awakened. Let it be once fully aroused and nothing on earth can stand against it.

The first step in this sound direction is the casting out of our life of the false ideal of Commercialism; the setting up once more of the old ideals. If we but do this we need have no fear for this Republic.

Let us set before ourselves the old ideals and follow them as our fathers followed them, through evil report and good report, to the end that Freedom may never perish out of the land, and that Peace and Happiness, Truth and Justice, Religion and Piety, may be established among us to all generations.

THOMAS NELSON PAGE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HOBBLED

BY ADA CAMBRIDGE

MELBOURNE, where I have had my home for eighteen years and which is the metropolis of a State to which I have belonged for more than twice that length of time, is a great city. I make bold to say that in the March of Progress she is well abreast of the foremost cities of the British Empire, if not of the world. And this is not to disparage the other Australasian capitals, most of which (by nature's favor) are more beautiful, and one, to my thinking, incomparable. All are little mirrors kept bright and ready to reflect the face of civilization, every chop and change in social fashion caught and reproduced within a few weeks of its appearance upon the horizons of Europe. I focus on Melbourne because here I am, and my subject under my nose, merely desiring to make it clear to the reader that it is not a local subject, nor its local character and equipment any different from what they are in London, Paris, or New York. As showing that I do not understate the case let me quote the opinion of a great and traveled actress who recently visited us (an actress is above royalty as an authority on such matters). She said—nay, she published it in an English newspaper as a notable discovery—that we were the best-dressed women she had seen in any country.

Dress, however, is not my subject, but only a natural introduction to my subject. It was the hobble-skirt suggested it.

Not the original of a year or two ago, the bag with the draw-string round the ankles, the literal hobble such as we use to restrain the wanderings of our bush horse; it would be unfair to the subject to make a text of that. Because, as soon as it appeared, one recognized that it was not a serious proposition, but just a stroke of saturnine humor on the part of some sartorial dictator, who bet somebody

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that he could make the little fools do anything and was dared to try. Certainly he won his wager in a way, thanks to the force of habit, but he also learned, probably for the first time, that his powers were not quite absolute. The offense was so flagrant, so violently resented, and so soon put down that many even of those who think they know everything do not know, and now never will, what the true hobble-skirt looked like in the open street.

But if the inverted bag is gone, the pillow-slip—the bolster-case, rather—remains, and that is almost as lamentable a sight when it presents the height of fashion. Its effect behind, and especially its effect when the wearer is pressed for time, is so incontestably funny that one marvels at the sustained and defiant courage wasted in its support (for if she cannot see her own back she can always see its counterpart). Just enough stuff to let the skirt hang free, to free the legs within, would convert the monstrosity into a thing of grace; yet she will not have it. And then regard the correlative hat—literally the crowning insult. In nine cases out of ten that hat of late years has been a thing to make angels weep. Its worst extravagances have abated, but one fears this only means that the time limit for a pronounced fashion is nearing expiration, and the votaries of fashion casually lapsing into sanity until the next wave of madness comes along. Strange phenomenon to the philosophic eye! The great argument for dress, as so dominant an element in woman's life, is that it is her duty to make herself as beautiful as she can; but here she is and here she will be next year, if it be thus decreed, deliberately using it to make herself ugly—knowing she is so using it, knowing that everybody else knows it, and particularly that man knows it, for whom ultimately all is done. How is one to explain such lunacy?

I am a woman's woman; I am even—although I detest the term—a woman's rights woman; but I wish sometimes that tyrant man would exercise his brute power in this matter. That he does not "turn" under the provocation of such frocks and hats as have lately been brought into his family and at least refuse to pay for them argues him but an imitation tyrant, after all, without the brutality of a worm.

Individually and behind the scenes one knows he has his say. A significant little tale came to me from a dressmaker at the time when the tube-skirt was the season's novelty and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the "rage"; I cannot think of it without wanting (disloyally, I know) to pat the unmentioned hero on the back. A lady ordered of this dressmaker a costume of the latest mode; the correct skirt measurement had been promulgated and was duly adhered to; fitted on when completed, it gave perfect satisfaction. It was sent home. Three days later it was returned, the skirt ripped (very roughly with a knife) from hem to waist, and a note from the victim of the outrage requested the dressmaker to repair the damage with a new back width "somewhat fuller than the last."

But such sporadic demonstrations are of small avail as checks to a movement so organized and wide-spread. What one would like to see in the circumstances—the second decade of the twentieth century on its way and vandalism recrudescent, flouting an enlightened age—is an equally organized and wide-spread male public opinion, healthy and temperate, showing its sense that the thing, being socially retrogressive, was worth attention and attack; instead of the cynical and unintelligent "it-pleases-them-and-don't-hurt-us" attitude, a brotherly concern for a sister's frailty, a knightly solicitude for Beauty in distress. How powerfully these would work to steady the feather-heads so easily led by the nose! It should not be needed and it is a humiliation to invoke it, but some such aid seems called for and might legitimately be exercised to save silly women from themselves and incidentally to buttress the hardly won repute and status of those who are not silly—or perhaps I should say not *so* silly. For alas and alas! I am afraid that in this matter of the surrender of the female will and conscience to the hypnotic force of fashion there is scarcely one of us that is without sin.

And here comes in the subject—not without a sad dignity of its own despite its clothes: Corporate Woman and her place in the line of march—why it is not alongside her mate and recognized to be so; why her standing and standards are different from his in the ways that make one inferior to the other; why their "rating," as we may call it, is not one and the same.

It ought to be the same. A million times has the fact been proclaimed, a million times disputed; but there it is—an axiom of nature, her plain intention—it ought to be the same. And it is not.

Why not? Sickening as the reiteration of the question

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

may be, it would be foolish to give it up. Not only that, but criminal, because, being the unnatural situation that it is, it must be ourselves that created it and by the same token we who have the responsibility of putting it right. Nature is the common scapegoat and appearances are often against her, but with all her so-called favoritisms, her sex differentiations, the unsophisticated tigress holds her own, while the hen ostrich and the mother stickleback do more than hold their own. It would be absurd to argue that we are the only animals in the world of which male and female did not get a fair and equal start.

We must have had a fair start, we women. And although history records that we have lived up to it from time to time, in ancient Rome and elsewhere, it is indisputable that we have been losing way for ages and that we are disgracefully behindhand still. Here are the hobble-skirt and cart-wheel hat to prove it.

How did it happen?

The ultimate cause of anything is beyond sight, but as far back as eyes can see there looms the form of that disastrous sinner who invented war with his own kind. We take for granted it was a he whose dawning human nature prompted his animal intelligence to the initial crime, although it might as easily have been a she; one reasons from results which support the settled theory of all shes that he began it. And the first engagement would certainly have taken place at the convenient domestic hearth—or whatever answered for a hearth; perhaps he wanted her bone, or it may have been her nut. So our primal misfortune befell us. Given a contest, there must be a winner and a loser, and by the chance of fate, or because she was taken unawares, and not necessarily because she deserved it, the prehistoric wife got the worst of the encounter. This would unduly elevate the prehistoric husband in his own esteem, and the moral advantage to him must have been incalculable. Nothing succeeds like success, and chivalry in that morning twilight of the world was a thing undreamed of. Next time they tried conclusions it was not on equal terms, he with his new-born confidence in himself and she discouraged and cowed. Consequently she was beaten again—and so on until she was subdued, forcibly inhibited from exercising as of yore what may be called her virile faculties. And there you are.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Behold her presently grown accustomed to her abject state—out of the running—taken up with the lighter pursuits to which she is confined. Behold him without the natural check and balance of her equal will and his respect for it indulging, over-indulging his male propensities at her expense. The relation of the sexes is indicated, if not established—the fashion of the future set.

I am not blaming him for a moment any more than I would blame water for running down-hill instead of up. He was the victim of circumstances. So was she. So, in the natural sequence of events, are we, their descendants, in this present year of grace. But theirs were circumstances over which they had no control and ours are not. That is the point. They knew no better and we do.

How well we do! Yes, women as well as men. We laboriously manufacture an appearance of immaturity which deceives ourselves as well as them, but when we really want to show that we are grown up we can always do it. I suppose the women of America have done it most effectually; I think their sisters in Australia are not far behind. The records of our Australian universities prove that, number for number, the women students gain more academic distinctions than the men.

But here is another point: It was not so long ago that our lord and master was doing precisely what we are doing now—giving his attention to fine clothes and petty follies—with precisely the same result. No miracles of discovery and achievement, such as have transformed the world in later times, were wrought or thought of when dress with him, as now with us, was a serious business of life. Only think of the creatures, belaced and bewigged, strutting about in all the colors of the rainbow, with their gamblings and flirtations and miscellaneous frivolities! If a few of our modern university girls could have been turned loose among them then, they would have made those dandies look just as silly as their descendants, who have put away childish things in order to do the work of men, make us look now.

So, after all, it is not necessary to go the whole way back to account for things. Doubtless Mrs. Pepys was a more efficient human being than her spouse. An entry in the immortal diary (such a "feminine" production!) clearly points that way: "To my great sorrow, find myself £43 worse than I was the last month, which was then £760 and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

now it is but £717. But it hath chiefly arisen from my layings out in clothes for myself and wife: *viz.*, for her about £12 and for myself £55 or thereabouts." Her mind must have been far more at leisure for impersonal concerns. For the matter of that, we may substitute our own so very late Queen Victoria for Mrs. Pepys, not to speak of the Roman matron of whom we have such flattering reports—still less of the prehistoric ancestress before her fall. Queen Victoria used no cosmetics for the enhancement of a far from fine complexion; she wore no wig over her graying hair, even when it became so thin that you could see through it; she stuck to her old fashions of dress when she liked them, too busy with more important things to change for the sake of change. And no king of them all surpassed her.

I love to believe that everything in its own nature is sound and good, that nothing but tampering ignorance has set matters wrong, and that growing knowledge will gradually put all right. I am indeed quite sure that the case is so. Why, what jeremiads are poured forth about this and that "cancer" of social life! And now I learn on scientific authority that physical cancer, with its awful potentialities, comes from no malignancy inherent in itself, but simply from a loss of equilibrium in the interplay of certain molecules that are perfectly healthy when their natural action is undisturbed — the "disproportionate preponderance" artificially produced of some elements of our being over others to which John Stuart Mill ascribes one of the most intractable of our social diseases and which we may take to be more or less the source of them all.

And if the whole "principle of evil" in the world is no more than this—good mismanaged—how simple a matter to deal with it! Here is a fine machine put out of gear by inadvertent ignorance, and all we have to do is to readjust and repair it—having, of course, first learned how. "That all?" you query, and I know it looks the same "large order" that it ever was; but it is not so, being from this view a hopeful task and not a hopeless, which makes all the difference. And no reasonable being, divine or mortal, asks to have everything done at once or that one laborer at the job should undertake the various duties of the rest. For example, it is not our duty to clear the gap between ourselves and the leaders of the expedition at a flying jump and start as full-blown Marconis to-morrow.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Small beginnings that are the roots of all great endings are decidedly indicated in our case. Not only can we clear no gap at all, not even a street gutter, we cannot even jump for it until the back width is slit up with a knife or a tenderer hand puts in a new one "somewhat fuller than the last." That is where we must begin. It is all very well to talk of the suffrage and the laws—they represent the pounds that can take care of themselves; the pennies are the first consideration. We shall have our equality with man recognized all right when we are equal, but that is not yet—while we are tangled up in chiffons and he goes free. I am very sure we did not aid him in his escape from the same toils, and he will not aid us—or so it seems. But why should he? We too are quite capable of emancipating ourselves. We are not shut up. The road is open before us. Nothing prevents us, I am convinced, but the immense network of material trifles that we have spent our lives in spinning until it has smothered us, body and spirit, in its folds; and that we can get out of any day we like just as easily as we got in.

The only difficulty—the main difficulty of any undertaking—is to begin. But how difficulties do melt away (excuse the platitude) when you stand up to them! This Moloch of fashion—where is he? Who is he? Put out a hand to feel him and you touch air. Moreover, we *have* demonstrated to ourselves that he is a bogy of our own creation. We *did* make a beginning when we refused his ankle-strap skirt, intimating (for the first time within my recollection) that a line must be drawn somewhere. That was really a remarkable revolt—if only we had followed it up instead of weakly compromising on the bolster-case! But after such ages of body-and-soul subjection it could not reasonably be expected of us that we should cease to be cowards all at once. It was a beginning, anyway.

Now how to go on—for go on we must, belated as we are. Well, there is the men's example. If you prefer not to be beholden to them, there are our grandmothers and great-grandmothers to give us useful hints. Those admirable women, not having time and brain power to waste, held to one fashion of costume for years and years. Under that system they had a far better chance of being always well dressed than we who change it every season; their stuffs were sound and lasting, the workmanship fine and finished,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

conscientious like all their work; the cost, compared with our expenses, next to nothing. For you see those were the days of importance for the housewife and mother, whose economic usefulness to the family and the community was equal to that of her husband. She ran so many industries in their joint business that he could no more have prospered in life without her than she without him. It was impossible for her to be continually thinking about clothes, although I am sure she loved her few gowns, old friends as they were, far more than we our multitudinous and perennially new ones. And I know that some of them were beautiful because I have seen them.

Times have changed, you say. Those productive processes to which she gave her mind are now otherwise carried on. Where would be the sense of doing yourself what machines are made to do better and cheaper? And what about the thousands and millions of poor things whose livelihood depends on the present volume and ceaseless mutations of the trade in dress? The same answer fits both questions. There is inexhaustible occupation waiting for us still, untouched, undreamed of—better uses for heads and hands than they were ever put to or are put to now. And not men's work, either. They and we are at the beginnings of knowledge, not the end; there is plenty of room for us both side by side without overlapping. As for the countless and accumulating multitudes who sew and sell and have their being in our clothes, the waste and sacrifice of human material that they represent are the worst features of the whole business. They are our victims, those slaves of fashion, whom we, slaves ourselves, have dragged at our heels, and whom, on the fallacious good-for-trade theory, we have supposed benefited by our follies to an extent justifying their excess and continuance. We have not benefited them. We have tied them down with our laces and fallals when they might have soared.

"The brains these fragile webs enmesh!
The wings of thought they tie!
The energies of soul and flesh
They still or stultify!
God! what world-wealth in unsown seeds,
What all-potential dreams and deeds,
In women's workshops die,
While spacious realms of life are stored
With such vast mysteries unexplored!"

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Those poor girls whom we should speak of as being "thrown out of employment" would not lose it so suddenly as that; they would retire by degrees, and by concurrent degrees be drawn into the worthier pursuits that their employers would have to take to. So huge a reform would go slow for a long time. It would need wise and temperate leaders, not headlong cranks. Heavens! if the wise and temperate (in other things), the more intelligent and highly educated and influential among us, would only awake to the responsibility that lies upon them—responsibility to an upward struggling world, and especially at the present crisis in its affairs, which calls for all its stock of common sense—the thing would virtually be done.

They have but to set an example—an example of mere sobriety. Is that much to do? Our grandmothers did it without effort or thought, and the money they saved upon intoxicating liquors, so to speak, provided excellent nourishment for the body politic of their day. Queen Victoria was a more efficient queen and no less dignified a lady for her unconcealed gray hair and furrowed face and sometimes dowdy garments. Not that we want dowdiness—emphatically not. Beauty, beauty all the time! That is just what the hobble-skirt set us crying for. But what *is* beauty when reduced to its elements? Surely first of all sincerity, then simplicity, then harmony, appropriateness—in short, most of the ingredients at present conspicuous by their absence from the creations of fashion and which the creators only use by accident, apparently, from time to time. Finally, the thing we have grown accustomed to.

Now see how accustomed we have grown to the masculine coat and trousers. Times without number have we been told how hideous they are, but the fact remains that our finest taste is satisfied when a gentleman "as is a gentleman" appears dressed for dinner or a garden-party or a shoot in the long-established manner. The occasional suggestions, said to have emanated from poor King Edward (fine man that he was, he *did* have a few feminine proclivities), that his sex should introduce more change and gaiety and color into its clothes—suggestions calculated to send cold chills adown the spine of the most elementary sociologist—passed by ears attuned to higher calls like the idle wind. The powers be praised! Had one man whose social influence was greater than his sense acted upon the hint others

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

would have followed him, and the clock might have been put back for generations. But no; I fancy it would have been a case of hobble-skirt again and that *we* should have nipped his enterprise in the bud. Think how we should feel if a man, hitherto "correctly" tailored, walked into our drawing-room with so much as a frill of lace on his shirt-front—how we *do* feel when he sports loud checks and diamond rings. Too disgusted and contemptuous for words. One is always more quick to see what is ridiculous in others than what is so in oneself.

Very well. Then here is our first step indicated. So soon as we find ourselves furnished with an agreeable fashion, to hold on to it like grim death for just as long as it suits us so to do; never minding about the disorganization of trade, which is bound to readjust itself and share the common gain in the end.

By the rule of averages the sheath-skirt and extinguisher-hat should be succeeded by something pretty, although we must be prepared for an attempt at seven widths over a crinoline. Intermediately our bonds, already loosening, will be loosened a little more—we can stop at the happy mean. The straight-hanging skirt within which legs can move freely and which clears the ground is the most comfortable one we know and the most graceful; and our Moloch could not take that garment from us if we had the resolution to keep it. Witness his difficulty in depriving us of those chief treasures of our wardrobe, the blouse and the "tailor-made"; assuredly he never meant us to keep anything so useful and economical for such a length of time. The short, round bodice might stay too; it does not correlate corsets or nipping belts; it is charming in its adaptation to the figure of youth, and, appropriately modified, it would be of great advantage to the appearance of those of us who are not young—incipient mothers and ladies developing embonpoint in the wrong place—who have not been allowed to try it; at any rate, not in modern times. Oh, rapture of comfort to have no waist to think of! One would go about feeling more like an angel than a woman. That one thing alone would lift life up enormously. As for the head—a (reasonably) wide-leaved hat to sit right down on it, as a man's hat on his, for summer; a cozy toque with alternate hood for winter; no heating pads, no hurting pins, no more trouble of sun and wind than of constricted waists and bedrabbled

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

petticoats: that could be arranged with little difficulty when the main elements of costume were standardized.

These are mere hints offered for what they are worth. No uniform is suggested, no more extremes of one fashion or another, no more dictation save by conscience and common sense; simply a recognition of the destructively "disproportionate predominance" that the passion for dress has gained over the better passions of womenkind, and the resolution and the means taken to get it back where it belongs. And the very first step of all in the way of practical endeavor is to have fewer clothes and no constant call to think about them.

Between the rich who dress for dinner and the poor who are thankful for any decent covering lies the great world of women to whom this matter is of vital moment. To many of them a system that our grandmothers practised would have its points—three of everything—hats, frocks, boots, what not: a best, a second best, and an ordinary—Hightem, Tightem, and Scrub, to use terms once common in my own family. The beautiful best garment was for high-days and holidays, always ready for a party, a trip to town, a thoroughly fine Sunday; betweenwhiles it reposed in a lavender-scented drawer tenderly folded in tissue-paper; and it sometimes lasted without palling on its owners' or the public taste to the third generation. The second best, of a specially serviceable character, was for shopping and ordinary visiting and doubtful church weather; the third was the comfortable wear of every day. For a whole season, at the *very* least, a middle-class lady thus equipped could dress almost mechanically, satisfied that she was "all right" without taking a moment's thought about it. In our day we should need more stuff for the wash-tub, but even so consider what some such simple and so easily practicable a system would do for the poor things who now spend night and day and all their little hard-earned income in the struggle to keep up with the ever-changing mode—in many classes a matter of necessity and not of choice. Automatically they would become leisurely, large-minded, well-to-do. They would have money to buy books and time to read them and thought to give to them; they would have chances to see the world, to learn life, to grow up, to spread out, to develop in every direction. In such light marching order they would rapidly overhaul the advance column which has had the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

labor of clearing the trail and opening up the (to us) undiscovered country. . . .

But stay. . . .

My mind's eye has been filled with the pleasing vision of a family circle engaged in reading aloud and listening to and drinking wisdom from these words. Materfamilias in her arm-chair knitting socks for a grandchild, perhaps, as I might be doing myself; seeing things from her and my standpoint of life and murmuring to herself at intervals: "How just! How true!" A son giving an ear from time to time while apparently immersed in his evening paper; dropping a "Hear! Hear!" at the mention of man's achievements, emitting an appreciative chuckle at the tale of the back width and the knife. Conscience-stricken daughters, aroused to serious thought of their position and responsibilities, and the becomingness or otherwise of the suggested costume that must not be changed. Paterfamilias—ah, paterfamilias, whose province it is to lay down the law, he has heard every word, but he has said nothing; he has sat so silent in the background that the mind's eye has hardly noticed him. And now, just as my peroration is reverberating in the receptive minds, inspiring the responsive spirits, here he pokes in, his fine old crusted apophthegm on his lips, to spoil the whole effect. . . .

Oh, man, man, do think before you speak! And think with your own fresh, natural thoughts and not the worm-eaten old thoughts of others. Don't you *know,* by the analogy of your own case, that while women are women wife love and motherhood must always come first of all? Do *you* love *her* less than when you were spending £12 on her clothes as against £55 on your own? Are your important pursuits more important to you than the welfare of your children? Was there any declining birth-rate noticeable in the families of our busy grandmothers or of the great ruling women of the more distant past? You are never tired of accusing us of being illogical, but where is the logic of the contention that woman to become more valuable to the world must become less valuable to man? At present his cultivated intelligence is greater than hers, as so it ought to be, but in natural intelligence — I do not say the case is reversed, but that at least they stand equal. She has enough, at any rate, to see farther than her nose. And with such a stock as they will have between them when both are culti-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

vated, do you suppose they will not better the home as well as everything else? Of course they will. And it can be bettered, too, without any damage to the foundations. Dear paterfamilias, be happy! We old fogies *have* to let the next generation do its work in its own fashion, and it will be done on "improved principles" somehow because that has always been the way of it. In the last resort we can sustain ourselves—we who are not illogical—with the most logically deduced certainty that good does *not* come out of evil, although it comes out of labor and sorrow almost every time. Good comes out of good, and *vice versa*. If we see to the planting of the seed of good that our own time calls for, we can well afford to leave it to grow just any way it likes.

ADA CAMBRIDGE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WHAT IS SOCIALISM?

BY A. MAURICE LOW

III

AN EXPLANATION OF "THE RIGHTS" MEN ENJOY IN A STATE OF CIVILIZED SOCIETY

THE Socialist believes that the mere fact of birth endows man with certain "rights" which it is the duty of society to permit him to enjoy without molestation. There is, perhaps, no word that is more commonly used and more frequently abused by the Socialist than this word "rights," and it is because of his confusion of ideas and his inability to recognize that there is no such thing as an "inalienable right" that he is so easily deluded by the fallacies of Socialism.

It is, of course, a rash thing in this age to assert that in an organized state of society a "natural" or "inalienable" right does not exist. There is the Declaration of Independence still vibrant with Jefferson's passionate spirit to inspire men to hold fast in the faith of the doctrine of "inalienable rights." There are the works of the great philosophers who labored with such zeal to convince the world that there is an inherent "natural right" in man. Yet without presumption it may be repeated that man has no "natural rights."

That which more than anything marks the distinction between civilized and uncivilized society is that in the former the individual is nothing and society is everything; in the latter society is nothing and the individual is everything. The truth of this will be seen.

Among a savage people—a people so savage that they are not superior to the brutes—there is no law, and the only law is the law of the strong exactly as it is among the brutes. The lion seizes his prey because he has the strength; the jackal may starve so far as the lion is concerned. It is

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the same with the savage. He obeys the natural law, which is self-preservation. Whenever a people recognize, by tribal observation or some other form, that force is not the only law they have made the first step toward progress. It is only among a savage or barbarous people that man enjoys a "natural right"—that is, the right to exert his strength at the expense of his weaker neighbor.

In a civilized society man has no rights except those which society permits him to enjoy. From the day of his birth until the day of his death society allows him to enjoy certain so-called rights and deprives him of others; not, it should be understood, because society desires especially to favor or oppress the individual, but because its own preservation, welfare, and happiness are the prime considerations. And so that society may not perish, so that it may reach a still higher plane, so that men and women may become better citizens, society permits them certain privileges and restricts them in the use of others. Sometimes in the exercise of this power the individual is put to a great deal of inconvenience, even, at times, he suffers what appears to be injustice. This is to be regretted, but it is inevitable. The aim of civilized society is to do the greatest good to the greatest number, and because the largest number may derive benefit from the largest good the individual must subordinate his own desires or inclinations for the benefit of all. Examples of this deference of the individual to the mass we see at every hand. Let me make my point clear with a trifling illustration, which is typical of that yielding of the "rights" of the person to the larger "rights" of society.

Those persons who assert the "inherent rights" of a man will not deny that it is his "right," if he sees fit to exercise it, to drink whiskey where and when he pleases, for surely it cannot be logically contended that one man has no "right" to drink whiskey and another man has a "right" to drink water. Society dismisses the question of the right of the individual and turns it into a privilege. Society says to the man: "Under certain conditions and under certain restrictions you may drink whiskey."

"That," says the man, "is to deprive me of my right. I want to drink as my mood is and not according to your foolish, inconvenient, and unjust regulations."

Society replies: "Your protest is sound, but it is overruled. We do not consider your convenience, not even your

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

personal necessity, for we are quite prepared to admit you will suffer in consequence of our laws. But unless we deprive you of your right an injury will be done to society at large; and, of course, your right must give way so that society may not be harmed."

It seems unnecessary to explain why society deprives a man of the "right" indiscriminately to purchase or drink whiskey or why each one of us, perhaps, a hundred times a day is denied the exercise of certain "rights" or restricted in the use of others; but it may be well to point out that the collective wisdom of society is ever seeking to strengthen justice, to give a larger measure of freedom to the individual, to prevent oppression, to enlarge opportunity, to make society as a whole harmonious by making the welfare of society dependent upon the contentment of the individual. It would be foolish to pretend that society has reached the end for which it is ever striving, but it would be an insult to intelligence to deny that the constant tendency is upward or that the world has not advanced a long way toward the goal it hopes to reach. Progress at times is slow, painfully slow, and the naked feet of the children of men are cut by the stones that encumber the road over which they toil so tearfully; but it is their blood and their tears that wash away the obstacles and make the road easier for those who come after them. Even the Socialist has to admit there has been progress. Mr. Keir Hardie, the English Socialist, in his book *From Serfdom to Socialism* says:

> "In our own country the boundaries of freedom have been widening with the progress of the ages. The slave of a thousand years ago, with no more right than the swine he tended, has fought his way upward through serfdom to citizenship. The modern workman is, theoretically, the equal in the eye of the law of every other class. His vote carries equal weight in the ballot-box with that of the millionaire who employs him; he is as free to worship when and how he pleases as the noblest baron; his rights are in all respects the same as theirs."

Mr. Keir Hardie does not recognize that the reason why the modern workman has the same rights as "the millionaire who employs him" is that society has deprived every one of his "natural rights," and for them, has substituted certain socialized privileges that are artificial, but the enjoyment of which are secured to all. In the old days Mr. Keir Hardie's "noblest baron" would have enjoyed rights which

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

were denied the serf, and that was the golden age of natural rights. The baron, because he had the force or the cunning, made his serfs work for him, which was the natural right exercised by the strong over the weak. When society took away these rights it destroyed serfdom and made the former serf equal to the baron, not because the serf had one set of rights and the baron another, but because neither had any inherent rights, but both were granted certain privileges at the discretion of society so long as their use did no injury to society, but was, on the contrary, for the general benefit of society.

Here it is not out of place to call attention to the distinction between what are known as "moral rights" and the so-called "natural rights," but which, as I have already shown, are in no sense natural, but are purely artificial—that is, the conventions of society made for its own governance. The question of moral rights I shall not discuss, for that is a matter that belongs to the theologians; but a great deal of confusion is caused by men mixing up the moral law with the law made by man. It is sufficient here to say that when men talk about their "moral right" to be as well fed or as well clothed as their neighbors they are simply resorting to a vague phrase so as to escape having to use more exact terms; or else they are incapable of understanding that society is purely an artificial creation and subject to the laws made by the majority for what it believes is its own good. Men claim they have a "moral right," for instance, to life and liberty; but, of course, there is no such thing as a right to either, although they are permitted the enjoyment of both so long as they use them in the manner which society sanctions. Under certain exceptional circumstances a man is deprived of his life by judicial process and with the approval of society; men are frequently deprived of their liberty, sometimes perpetually, sometimes for varying periods. If there was such a thing as a moral right to life or liberty, judges who sentenced prisoners, executioners who executed them, jailers, sheriffs, guards, policeman—every one, in short, connected with the administration of justice—would be a moral outlaw, instead of which we defer to the opinions of judges and treat the administrators of justice with respect. A hundred years ago persons were deprived of their life for many trivial offenses and liberty was unknown; liberty has been granted

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and human life is held more sacred, not because a moral right exists to-day which did not exist a hundred years ago, but because man has advanced on the road to civilization. He sees the folly of taking the life of a woman for stealing a loaf of bread to save her baby from starvation; the privilege of liberty has been given because in the natural order of things the more intelligent men become the greater the liberty they demand; and that liberty they are permitted to enjoy, always, however, with the restriction that they must not infringe the liberty of any one else. That is what we mean when we talk about "rights."

To the individual certain so-called rights are granted because they are believed to be equally as advantageous to society as to the individual, and these are known as "vested rights." For instance, a man is given the right to buy a piece of property and to own it; he may do with it as he pleases — subject always to restrictions. He may let his property lie idle, or he may live in the house he builds on it, or rent the house, or he may sell the property and make a profit, or he may give it away. To that extent he has liberty of action, but here again society steps in and puts a limitation on his liberty. He may build his house of a prescribed height; he may use certain materials, but must not use others; he must comply with certain regulations governing construction; on a certain piece of property he may build a house, but he must not build a shop or a factory. So long as the individual obeys the rules made by society he is secure in the enjoyment of his "vested rights."

How does the individual come to enjoy a vested right or a right in anything? Every right and every restriction of a right is, as I have already said, simply the concrete expression of society, and the only way by which society can make its voice heard is to speak through the law. There is, of course, no difference between a large right and a little right, for the law makes no fine distinctions in principle. A man is no more secure in his property, which may have cost a hundred thousand dollars, than is the Socialist in his collar, which may have cost twenty-five cents. If a collarless Socialist should approach a Socialist on the street and say to him, "Give me your collar, for I have none, and the presumption is that as you are wearing a collar you have another at home and you can afford to part with your surplus," it is more than a probability that the demand

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

would be refused; and should the attempt be made to take the collar by force the law would be invoked for the protection of the Socialist's property. Here, you see, there is no question raised of the "moral" right of the man to retain possession of his collar; he is simply upholding the right that society has granted him. When Socialists talk about their "rights" they forget that they are attacking the law, and they further forget that under any system there must be laws, and the laws must be respected—that is, unless anarchy is to take place of law; and then, of course, there would be hopeless confusion, and the only law would be that of the strong, and the weak would suffer miserably at the hands of the strong, who, unrestrained by law, would know no law except the law of force.

The Socialist who preaches revolution would destroy all laws because he believes, or at least asserts, that the present laws are unjust and inadequate; but even if he should destroy every law in existence he must either enact a new code or there would be a revolution greater and more disastrous than that which he brought about. The moment he gave his sanction to a new set of laws that moment he would again come back to where he began his work of destruction and admit that mankind may only have those rights which society embodies in the law. The laws made by the revolutionary Socialist might be better than those now in existence or a great deal worse—that is, not of consequence, for all laws are merely a matter of experiment and evolution, and the vital principle is not affected, which is: That no man in a civilized state of society may do anything as a matter of right, but only as a favor granted by his fellowmen. When each man claims the right to do as he sees fit you have anarchy; when you lay even the slightest restriction on man's actions you have laid the foundation of law and the recognition that the right of the individual to exercise his will or his passions is subordinate to the right reserved by society to say what is good and what is harmful.

But the Socialist says that the rights which society now grants are injurious, and that he could create a better code. That, of course, is merely the arrogance of ignorance. It is notorious that the freest critics are those who have no power to create and who think that a thing they have never done is always easy. No doubt there are wise men among Socialists, but after all is said they are merely men; and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

there is no reason to believe that the concrete wisdom of the Socialists is greater than the rest of humanity which for hundreds of years has been seeking justice and right. Mankind is neither all good nor all bad. Even at a time when there was little justice there was always a saving remnant passionately preaching justice, contending for it against all opposition, until finally justice was established. That work is not finished; we are still striving for justice more exact, for absolute equality, for that breaking down of privilege which gives one man an unfair advantage over another. But when the Socialist says that he alone knows what is right or what is just, then we see that he is either dishonest or foolish. What is just? What is right? It is not what one man thinks, it is what society as a whole believes; and the Socialist proposes to try a dangerous experiment to show that he has greater wisdom than all the rest. And it is admittedly an experiment. Those of us who see the fallacies of Socialism are reluctant to have it tried. Certainly we are not willing to have the experiment made by men who have so little understanding of the structure of society that they talk about "rights" where no rights exist and when they are driven into a corner shift their ground by assuming to be able to create more perfect "rights" than those now established.

It cannot too often be repeated that there is no such thing as a "right." There are privileges which society can grant or reclaim as it sees fit. There can be no more effective way of disposing of some of the absurd claims of the Socialist than to remind him of that fact.

A. Maurice Low.

(To be Continued)

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE CHAOS OF BRITISH POLITICS

BY SYDNEY BROOKS

THE present moment finds British politics in a state of *confusion that almost reaches the point of incoherency.* We used in England to think them comparatively simple. We used to pride ourselves on the stable succession of Liberals by Conservatives and Conservatives by Liberals. We used to contrast the harmonious interplay of our two-party system with the tangled warfare of groups and factions that on the Continent does duty for Parliamentary Government. These titles to satisfaction are ours no longer. The irruption twenty-five years ago of a pledge-bound and independent Irish party, forming temporary alliances with both of the historic parties, but absorbed in neither, was the first sign that the machine which had worked so smoothly for two whole generations was getting out of gear. Since then, without the average Englishman being wholly conscious of it, it has been smashed to atoms and rebuilt on a far more intricate model. A more intricate model, but not, perhaps, so new an one as people think. The conditions of present-day party politics in Great Britain appear to be undergoing a transformation which is not so much a revolution as a reversion. Complicated as they are, they are not more so than they were during the years that followed Sir Robert Peel's adoption of Free Trade in the forties or during the latter end of the eighteenth century. We might really seem in England to be returning to a type of Government with which our forefathers were tolerably familiar and under which they managed to conduct the business of the country with astonishing success. They grappled with and overcame pretty nearly all the difficulties that confront us to-day. Parties no longer compact and homogeneous wholes, but split up into contending sections; Cabinets formed less to prosecute a definite and united policy than to conciliate this

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

interest and that; the electorate bewildered by a multiplicity of factions; and the business of Government forced from a straightforward path into devious routes milestoned with deals and bargains and log-rolling accommodations — all these phenomena which astonish us to-day have been at one time or another the commonplaces of English politics. It was, indeed, out of a confusion worse confounded than our own that the Liberal and Conservative parties were hammered, divided the nation into almost equal halves, and for more than fifty years, with a regularity that seemed to be the product of natural law, assumed alternately the guidance of affairs. Some such evolutionary phase may again lie ahead of us; and the floating atoms of British politics may once more precipitate into two stable and comprehensive parties of "Socialists" and "non-Socialists." That, however, is a development of the future. For the time being all is chaotic, transitional, and uncertain.

But if the aspects presented by British politics to-day recall, and can in a measure be paralleled by, the past, in other and more vital ways they are altogether singular to the times in which we live. A mid-Victorian statesman, indeed, would be hard put to it to recognize in the England of the present the country and the institutions which he knew fifty or sixty years ago. In the past half-century the composition of the House of Commons, the conditions under which it works, the questions that most engross it, and the popular attitude toward it have all completely changed. The House no longer has the hold over the country that it used to have. To be a member of Parliament is still an honor, but scarcely the honor it was. It is a claim to consideration where it used to be a claim to distinction. It carries with it a position, but the position has been robbed of much of its old prestige. It is a commonplace of English politics nowadays, for instance, as well as of English journalism, that the people no longer read Parliamentary debates. The political instruction of the nation is carried on outside the walls of the House of Commons. Men still look to members of Parliament for guidance and guidance is abundantly supplied to them—I know of no country where the average citizen has more or better opportunities of hearing both sides—but it is not from the Front Bench at Westminster, but from the platform at huge popular meetings, as a sort of perambulating lecturer on politics, that the rising states-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

man, and even the statesman who has already risen, now addresses the country.

Again, Parliament to-day has to compete for popular interest with a new and multiplying host of minor assemblies. There has been within the last thirty years a vast extension of local government throughout Great Britain. County Councils, Borough Councils, and municipalities have not only increased in numbers, but have quintupled their activities. Men who prefer the reality of power to its semblance and its appanages find a readier scope for their energies, can really achieve more, and, above all, can see their achievements bear immediate fruit if instead of entering Parliament they throw themselves into the work of local administration. The sphere is smaller, but its opportunities are more individual; and its duties, as Lord Rosebery has often insisted, at least as interesting and far more intimately related to the welfare of society. But though a beginning has been made with decentralization, the pressure and the complexities of Parliamentary business remain more formidable than ever. The widening sphere of local activities has been more than counterbalanced by the growth and urgency of national and Imperial affairs; and the plain fact that Parliament can no longer do its work, that it is hopelessly overburdened and congested and has ceased to be an efficient assembly, lies very near the root of popular impatience and indifference. The unforgettable record of the Unionist Government that waged the Boer War, and its blazing display of official incompetence, raised alienation for a time to positive and disgusted contempt. The English people have outgrown, perhaps forever, their old innocent and touching faith in the capacity of British Ministers merely because they are British Ministers. They feel the need of a higher standard of administration, and they are conscious that Parliament grows yearly less competent to provide it.

Nor is this all. The difference between the outside and the inside view of things political is always great. In England it is, perhaps, greater, as a rule, than in any other country. But in this matter of the authority, efficiency, and repute of Parliament, I note a most unusual approximation between the views of the average M.P. and the views of the average elector. One hears in the lobbies of the House of Commons expressions of weariness and discontent at least as whole-hearted as any that are uttered by the man in the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

street. The more earnest a Member of Parliament is, the more quickly does he become convinced that of all reforms the reform of Parliament is the most urgent. The rights and opportunities of the private member have been almost extinguished. The Cabinet grows yearly more and more autocratic and the House of Commons more and more subservient. It has happened more than once of late that the only question in which the country was interested has been denied discussion by the people's representatives through a skilful use of Parliamentary forms. The less crowded times when a measure could be debated clause by clause, almost sentence by sentence, have completely passed by. Nowadays the closure is automatically applied at the discretion of the Government, debate is regulated by a fixed time-table, whole clauses are voted *en bloc* without discussion, and from a deliberative assembly the House is relapsing more and more into an assembly that ratifies and registers the decrees of the inner Cabinet. From the point of view of achievement, of the possibility of getting things done, the private member to-day is nothing, and the Cabinet Minister, if he belongs to that little group which really constitutes a Cabinet within the Cabinet, everything; and it is scarcely too much to say that for matters to continue as they now are must ultimately mean the extinction of Parliamentary government of the old type and the substitution for it of Cabinet government.

We have, indeed, all but reached that stage already. Legislation tends with increasing celerity to become a mere matter of executive decree. The independent man, who refuses to obey every crack of the party whip, is extinct. The upshot of all divisions in the House of Commons is a foregone conclusion. Debate has become merely a formal and futile accessory to a predestined course of events. There never was a time when the caucus in the constituencies was more despotic or the organization of parties inside the House more rigid or Parliamentary procedure more mechanical. Even the sporting interest which used to attach to the deliberations of the national legislature is gone; and to a student of political phenomena Great Britain affords an extraordinary example of the ease with which determined minorities can manipulate the direction of affairs in the name of "the people," but to their own advantage. The result of a General Election nowadays is that the repre-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sentatives of one-half the voters in the kingdom claim and exercise the right to a virtually unrestricted power over the other half, and that nearly all legislation in consequence is conceived and passed in the interests and under the pressure of particular classes and sections. Ministries nowadays treat both Parliament and the electorate with a high-handedness that is the quintessence of Jacobinism. They introduce a bill voting themselves and all other members of the House a salary of two thousand dollars a year without making the least attempt to consult the voters in advance and ascertain their views on a measure which may powerfully affect the quality of Parliament and which has certainly lowered its standing in the popular mind. If any of their bills meets with a mishap in its passage through the House and an amendment is carried against it, they see nothing strange in summoning the assembly forthwith to cancel its obnoxious vote and to proceed with the bill as though nothing had happened. In the relentless hounding out of public life of all men who show the least inclination to take a line of their own; in the increasing tendency to vest the interpretation of Acts of Parliament in Government departments instead of in the law courts, and to reverse inconvenient or unpopular judicial decisions by legislative enactment; and in the multiplications of bureaucratic functions one sees the symptoms of a possible collapse of the party system as an instrument of representative government. Small wonder that in their anxiety to reassert the authority of the electorate and to temper the arbitrary character of Parliamentary proceedings, Englishmen in growing numbers should be advocating the Referendum, proportional representation, the election of the Cabinet by the House of Commons itself on a non-partisan basis, and similar devices for curbing that ministerial autocracy which has supplanted, and may in the end prove not less intolerable than, the monarchical absolutism of former days.

Nor do these portents stand alone. The spread of cheap distractions and enjoyments and of cheaper newspapers has not only weakened the popular interest in politics, but has impaired that faculty of concentrated and continuous thought which used to invest affairs of State with an attractiveness not so greatly inferior to that of football. Within the last few years, during the struggle between the Lib-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

erals and the House of Lords, the British people saw their old Constitution, which was perhaps the most adaptable and convenient system of government that the world has ever known, brought definitely to an end. They saw the powers of an ancient assembly truncated with a violence that in almost any other land would have spelled barricades and bloodshed. They saw the road cleared, or partially cleared, for developments that must profoundly affect, and that in all probability will absolutely transform, the whole scheme of the British State. And all this they watched with hardly a flicker of popular emotion. When Roundheads and Cavaliers were lining up for the battle of Edgehill a Warwickshire squire was observed between the opposing forces placidly drawing the coverts for a fox. The British people during the progress of the constitutional conflict seemed more than once to resemble that historic huntsman. They answered the screaming exhortations of the politicians with whispers of more than Delphic ambiguity; they went unconcernedly about their pleasures and business, to all appearances unvexed by the din of revolution in their ears; they presented the spectacle, more common in France than in England, of a tranquil nation with agitated legislators; and the only tenable explanation of their conduct was simply that they were not interested. For the great masses of the democracy the politics of bread and butter have completely ousted the politics of ideas and abstractions, and have imported, it should be added, into the general estimate of men and measures a cynical and mercenary note that is a new and disquieting phenomenon in British public life. Moreover, as was conspicuously seen at the time of the great coal strike a year ago, and to a lesser degree in the railway strike of the preceding summer, the fight between Labor and Capital, which is *the* outstanding issue of our times, lies, and must necessarily lie, very largely outside the jurisdiction of Parliament. Parliament, that is to say, is being overshadowed by outside agencies and organizations. It can never, or hardly ever, pass any measure or adopt any course of action so vital to the well-being of the country as the decisions which may at any moment be come to in the executive offices of the great labor and capitalistic federations.

And besides all this, and as a further and not less disturbing element in the present situation, there is the fact

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that the British Constitution is in suspense. The Parliament Act of 1911 was designed to shackle the powers of the House of Lords. Its essential clause laid it down that any bill other than a Money Bill which is passed by the House of Commons in three successive sessions in not less than two years shall become law, in spite of the opposition of the House of Lords. Thus the Irish Home Rule Bill on January 30th was rejected by the Upper Chamber. In the old days that would have meant the death of the measure. But under the provisions of the Parliament Act the Home Rule Bill will be reintroduced and passed in the House of Commons next session and sent up again to the Lords. If they again throw it out the same operation will be repeated in the following session, and even if the Lords reject the bill for the third time it will none the less become law. This obviously is an extremely clumsy and roundabout way of doing things and it is not intended to be permanent. At some future but unspecified date that seems to grow every year more remote, the Liberals are pledged to tackle the problem of reforming the composition of the House of Lords, and if and when that exceedingly difficult and delicate undertaking is carried through, the Parliament Act will necessarily be amended to square with the new state of affairs. But for the present its provisions are in full force and the Liberals in consequence are under a strong, and indeed an irresistible, compulsion to pass as many measures as they possibly can in the early sessions of each Parliament. The duration of Parliament is limited by the Act to five years; a governmental measure can only be passed over the heads of the Lords after two years have elapsed since its second reading in the House of Commons; the result is that if the Liberals are to appear before the country, when the hour for a General Election has struck, with a record of successful achievement, they must crowd their principal measures into the first two or two and a half years of their existence. This is precisely what they have been doing. Never has Parliament been so ruthlessly overworked or the public so bewildered by the numbers and immensity of the bills it reads about in the papers and hears discussed from the platform as since the election of December, 1910. Measures that in other and saner days would each monopolize a whole session are now driven four abreast at breakneck speed through a jaded and distracted House by the use and abuse of every

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

device for limiting debate, gagging the Opposition, and overriding the established forms of Parliamentary procedure.

Such are some of the more general features of the present political situation in Great Britain; and they are sufficiently serious to stir many anxious misgivings. Nor are one's apprehensions quieted when one turns to a study of the separate parties and examines their prospects and programmes. In the last week of January the Government were obliged to drop their long-promised and momentous measure of Electoral Reform under circumstances that covered them with ridicule, and the magnitude and unexpectedness of the disaster have left them sore, bewildered, and dismayed. But the Opposition are in hardly any better plight. Ever since the New Year they have been absorbed with internal dissensions and recriminations over the leading plank in their platform—the additional taxation, namely, of food with a view to granting the various units of the Empire a preferential entrance into the British market. The upshot of a process of self-inquiry which threatened at one moment to bring about another change in the Unionist leadership and to disrupt the party both in and out of the House is that the policy of Imperial Preference, outlined by Mr. Chamberlain ten years ago and consistently advocated ever since as the only means of "saving the Empire," has been so profoundly modified as to be almost abandoned; but not a Unionist can tell how far the desertion of the flag under which they have fought for a decade will favorably impress the electorate. There is something, indeed, in the state of the Unionist party at this moment that might well move even the most ferocious of Liberals to a passing commiseration. Always excepting Mr. Balfour, they have not a man of first-rate ability among them. Never in modern British politics has a party been so bleakly destitute not merely of commanding, but even of interesting personalities. Its nominal leader, Mr. Bonar Law, has been a very doubtful success. He has, it is true, some at least of the attributes of political generalship; he fights, he shows sport, he is confident, plain-spoken, always aggressive, and not infrequently deliberately provocative. It has happened two or three times that his zeal in attack has outrun discretion and that his sallies have delivered him into the hands of the enemy. But a party will forgive much to a leader who has an air of pugnacity and directness and determination and shows

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that he means business and possesses driving-power. Mr. Balfour, for all his agility in criticism and defense, was often vacillating in attack. He was alternately delighting his followers and disheartening them. He seemed at times as a leader equally indispensable and disastrous; and he never quite succeeded in establishing a current of sympathy and comprehension with the mass of the people. It is one of Mr. Bonar Law's good points that he is always intelligible. He understands the "man in the street" and is understood by him; and that is a very considerable asset. But while in these respects the new leader has advantages that the old one did not command, in other respects it is almost ludicrous to institute a comparison between the two men. Mr. Balfour was a first-rate statesman in charge of a third-rate party. The party remains as it was; but it has now found a second-rate leader and feels more at home with him. The descent from the intellectual standpoint is prodigious. Mr. Balfour never takes part in a debate that he does not raise it to a higher level. Mr. Bonar Law's speeches, so far as quality and ideas are concerned, are those of the average party hack and nothing more. They are expressed, of course, with far more precision and lucidity and power than the average party hack can dispose of. But they are as barren of suggestiveness and of elevation and as intrinsically commonplace as the most ardent country gentleman could desire. Mr. Balfour is a philosopher and Mr. Bonar Law an ironmaster. The former has perhaps the most subtle, supple, spacious, and free-roving mind that has devoted itself to contemporary politics. The latter has the keen, quick, narrow mind of the Glasgow merchant. He belongs altogether to the new school, and is, indeed, a symbol of a new era. The Conservative party has never had a leader so divorced by birth and education and associations from the traditions of its past. He is a dealer in facts and not in ideas, a strong, pertinacious, clear-headed, unimaginative man of affairs, an effective but not an ingratiating debater, careless of "manner," intent on "results." The country is interested in him, if only because he is still on trial in a very difficult post; but it cannot as yet be said to have any great admiration for him, and it is perfectly conscious that, by comparison with his predecessor, he is of an inferior and second-rate stamp. To an onlooker it seems very plain that Mr. Bonar Law does not supply the Unionists with the most

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

desirable acquisition that a party in these days can possibly possess—a compelling personality.

Without great men you cannot have great ideas. A new England has arisen since the Boer War, throbbing with passionate aspirations, struggling as never before toward a closer equality of opportunity, sinking old political issues in a supremely earnest effort to grapple with the master question of "the condition of the people." Of this new England and its ideals and essence the Unionists betray hardly the smallest comprehension. They have not lost touch with it because they have never been in touch with it. They are as alien to its spirit and aims as if they lived—a great many of them as a matter of fact do live—in another world. Therein lies the party's fatal and fundamental weakness. The inquiring, restless, questioning, self-assertive, and self-realizing democracy of to-day has passed beyond them. They do not understand it; the French aristocracy before the Revolution was scarcely more blind to the portents that the old order was in process of disruption. Of the capacity for national leadership, of the power of dramatic sympathy, they show no signs. They have no policy of social reform whatever and no inkling of one. They cannot even evolve an agrarian programme that is in any way suitable to English conditions. Their Irish policy remains as unenlightened, as anti-Imperialist, and as purely obstructive as it was five and twenty years ago. In the past eight years they have used the House of Lords to throw out Liberal measures of social, educational, and electoral reform, and it was on their insistence that the Lords committed the monstrous outrage on the Constitution of rejecting the Budget of 1909. Yet when the Liberals put every other question on one side and closed with the Upper Chamber in a desperate grip, the Unionists, while rejecting the opportunity of settling the whole issue by conference and consent, practically threw the Lords overboard, officially discountenanced the idea of resisting the Parliament Act *à l'outrance,* and themselves put forward various schemes for reforming the Upper House that were decidedly more revolutionary and more opposed to what one had always supposed to be the principles of conservatism, than anything that the Liberals had proposed. The Unionist party, in fact, lacks the three prime requisites of political health. It lacks men; it lacks ideas; it lacks principles. It began by

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

welcoming almost effusively Mr. Lloyd George's Insurance Act. It applauded its objects and approved its principle. But the moment the leaders in the House found they could gain a temporary political advantage by opposing it they fell upon it tooth and nail. The most daring and beneficent scheme of national betterment ever proposed and carried in a single Parliament was twisted by them to serve their petty electioneering ends. Those were the tactics of men without any real convictions and simply bent on playing the immediate political game.

And now it turns out that they do not even believe in the scheme of Tariff Reform which they have preached incessantly for the past decade. Mr. Chamberlain in 1903 committed them to the advocacy of protection as a means of staying Great Britain's commercial decline, and of Imperial Preference, involving the taxation of food, as a means of cementing the Empire, which otherwise, he declared, would infallibly fall to pieces. It is hardly too much to say that every statement and prophecy he ventured upon has been falsified, and that every test by which he sought to prove the decay of British trade has served merely to show its gigantic and increasing expansion. Instead of a decade of ruin Great Britain has had a decade of records; and the yearly Board of Trade figures have made the whole case for Tariff Reform ridiculous. And as for Mr. Chamberlain's conviction that the Empire without preferential tariffs would drift asunder, it is enough to point to the Empire as it is to-day and to the enormous advance that the past seven years have witnessed in the direction of Imperial consolidation. At three successive elections the British people have conclusively demonstrated their repugnance to the Chamberlain programme, and the Unionists themselves have either lost all faith in it or have convinced themselves that it is a fatal obstacle to their return to power. Mr. Balfour in 1910, when he was still the leader of the party, pledged himself to submit the Tariff Reform Budget to a referendum before it went into effect. Lord Lansdowne last November announced that on further consideration the Unionist leaders had decided that Mr. Balfour's pledge was no longer binding. So great a cry of alarm and anger instantly came up from Lancashire that Mr. Bonar Law and Lord Lansdowne were forced to retract their retraction. They did not reinstate the referendum, but after five weeks

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

or so of heated discussion they gave it out that no additional food taxes would be imposed until they had been submitted to the people at a second General Election. That is equivalent to postponing them to the Greek Kalends. But whether the Unionists will gain anything by their latest manœuver is highly doubtful. They have practically killed Imperial Preference—the one feature of the Tariff Reform movement that lent it a touch of idealism and greatness; and they now find themselves saddled with Protection in its most squalid and corrupting form and with nothing whatever to offer to the British farmer except a tax on all he buys and on nothing he sells. That is a position in which I see little prospect of permanence. These endless tergiversations have well-nigh destroyed the confidence of the country in the sincerity and good faith of the Unionist party. Nobody knows what they stand for or what policy they would pursue if returned to power; and the confusion has been only intensified by the spectacle of "the party of law and order" backing up the extremists of Ulster in their threats of an armed rebellion.

Compared with the drifting helplessness of their opponents, the Liberals are undoubtedly in happier circumstances. They have held office for eight years; they have carried many great measures of reform; they have conducted the foreign policy of the kingdom with conspicuous success; they have vastly augmented its naval and military strength; they have set up an extremely high standard of efficient administration; and they have shown the two qualities that are most essential to political success—courage and imagination. There has never been in English history a more fruitful or a more energetic régime, and no sign is yet apparent of lassitude or staleness. But there are at least four fairly definite dangers that encompass them. In the first place, there is the question of Ulster. Nobody really knows what is going to happen in the northeast corner of Ireland if the Home Rule Bill becomes law. But it is clear that any Government which is faced with the necessity of coercing the Ulster Protestants in order to compel them to accept and obey a predominantly Catholic Parliament in Dublin will be very awkwardly placed. A good many Liberals believe that it would be better even now to submit the Home Rule Bill to a General Election so that a specific mandate might be obtained for dealing with its possible conse-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

quences; and the *Spectator* on February 1st gave it as its deliberate opinion that Mr. Asquith had decided in his own mind that this course would have to be taken. The inducement to adopt it is that Mr. Bonar Law has stated that the Opposition would advise Ulster to submit, or at any rate would not encourage it to resist, if an appeal to the electorate resulted in a verdict in favor of the Home Rule Bill. The inducements against it are that there could be no guarantee of confining the issue to Home Rule alone, that an adverse verdict would turn out the Government and destroy the bill, and that the risk of such a catastrophe would severely strain the relations between the Irish Nationalists and their Liberal allies. In any case, the Ulster problem would still remain; and as it is a problem that contains a potentiality of something like civil war, Liberals cannot be quite easy in their minds until it is settled.

Then, again, an indispensable element in the coalition that maintains the present Government in power is the Labor party, and the Labor men are auxiliaries who partake a good deal of the nature of guerrillas. They have no particular fondness for Mr. Asquith; Mr. Burns they detest; the Cabinet contains no member who is entirely acceptable to them; every outbreak of industrial unrest finds them at daggers drawn with the Government; in the constituencies they have repeatedly run candidates of their own against the Liberal nominee and have thus handed over seat after seat to the Conservatives; and if they were a little surer of the unplumbed social forces which they are supposed to represent, and if they had any strong leader or were less embarrassed by the consciousness that so far they have cut a rather poor figure in Parliament, they would probably cut adrift altogether from the Liberal connection. Even as it is they present Liberalism with a permanent dilemma that may at any moment become acute. For the Government to prosecute a policy which the Radical extremists and the Labor men can be persuaded to support is to arouse the opposition of a whole army of vested interests and to make every property-owner fidgety; and as Lord Rosebery reminded his former colleagues a few years ago, it is the suspicion of hostility to property that sooner or later has overthrown every Liberal Ministry of the last forty years. But not to prosecute that policy is to sign the death warrant of Liberalism and to abdicate in favor of Mr. Keir Hardie and the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Socialists. These are the fundamental alternatives between which the Government has to choose; and the choice taxes all its adroitness and all its resolution.

In the third place, there is the danger concealed in the question of Woman Suffrage. This is a question which cuts across all the normal lines of party division and which no Government that is ever likely to be in office in our time can afford to incorporate i its official programme, for the reason that both the Liberals and the Conservatives are at odds among themselves over its merits and expediency. In the present Cabinet, for instance, Mr. Asquith and Mr. Harcourt are among the stoutest opponents and Sir Edward Grey and Mr. Lloyd George among the warmest advocates of the women's claim, while among the Unionists it is espoused by Mr. Balfour and Mr. Lyttelton and derided by Mr. Austen Chamberlain and Mr. Long. No Government, therefore, can bring forward a measure for the enfranchisement of women as a Government measure, while the attempt to introduce it as an amendment to an official bill was responsible for the withdrawal of the Franchise Bill a few weeks ago, for the humiliation of the Government, and for the conversion of the House of Commons into a chaos. Whether the new device of promising Government facilities to a bill brought forward by a private member will succeed in disposing of the question remains to be seen; but so long as it is unsettled and the public mind is disturbed and exasperated by suffragette outrages and the public conscience rasped by the treatment of the offenders in prison so long will the Government suffer a certain loss of credit and authority. But the fourth and by far the greatest peril that besets the Liberals is their own insatiable energy. Conscious of the enormous leeway that has to be made up before England becomes a country that even approaches their ideal of what it should and might be, confronted on every side with unsolved questions and enticing vistas of social betterment, they have rather succumbed to the temptation of doing and attempting too much.

SYDNEY BROOKS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NEW BOOKS REVIEWED

A PSYCHOLOGICAL STUDY OF RELIGION: ITS ORIGIN, FUNCTION, AND FUTURE. By JAMES H. LEUBA. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1912.

A VERY rare quality informs this entire book—a strict intellectual integrity. The author, a psychologist by profession and an "empirical idealist" by philosophy, sits down quietly and rather sympathetically to apply to the various known forms of religion the categories of psychology, and determine whether or not they suffice to account for the religious experience and the prevalence of religious beliefs. He finds that they do so account. He is not averse to religion; he has had it, he likes it, and he seems to think that in some form or other it will be needed always. But when the question arises, Does it or does it not involve extra-human agents or essences? he replies, simply, "No, it does not." The origins of religious belief, the facts of religious experience, the postulates of religious emotions, are all capable of scientific explanation. They are the proper matter of science, and science can take care of them perfectly. Furthermore, the various latter-day theories which attempt to re-establish religion on its feet while discarding the Scriptures and the ancient guarantee of the Church are, in the first place, untenable, and, in the second place, self-contradictory. The Absolute of Hegel cannot be identified with that Father of Lights to whom men lift up their hearts.

He begins by distinguishing three types of rational behavior: the mechanical behavior, which is that of the engine-driver; the coercitive behavior, which is that of the wizard; and the anthropopathic behavior, which includes religion. While admitting that many religious people may have a lurking faith in magic, may want to begin an important undertaking on a lucky day, or be glad to find a four-leaved clover, and that many religious practices may degenerate into magic, like using the sign of the cross, the scapulary, and altars privileged for forty days' indulgence, he distinguishes sharply and very justly between the two attitudes of mind involved in the two sorts of practice. Magic is infallible—if you know the right charm the butter is bound to come or the rain or the cure. Religion is a matter of feeling and belongs in the great class of what we usually call human relations, though we hold the same relations with animals and with gods. He traces the natural, the inevitable rise of beliefs in gods who may be non-existent without affecting in any way that belief or the evidences for it. He urges that gods have arisen in various ways, not all from ghosts or dreams, nor yet all from thunder and the passing of the wind; in short, he prefers

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the theory of Mana to animism in point of time, and thinks the most primitive religions first knew a High God. "The belief in non-personal powers is neither a derivative from animism nor a first step leading up to it, but the two beliefs have had independent origins, and animism appeared second in order of time." The gods once made, whether ghostly, ancestral, or creative, they of course fuse, and thereafter the idea tends through centuries and generations to grow less and less fine, to resemble more and more the man in whom it lives and moves and has its being. "The gods have been debased, but the people themselves have been raised to a higher level by the lofty notions they have corrupted. This degrading process is the natural, unavoidable method by which the masses gradually rise toward the level of those who have set for them unattainable ideals." Such a god must be a spiritual or psychological agent, a personal power, hyperhuman in essence, invisible, accessible, and benevolent. Fear led to religion, but did not constitute it ever, and fear is no longer a strong motive among us. Awe, which is less selfish, is nearer the precise feeling, and "in Protestant religions men have, as a whole, set their faces away from the dreadful and toward the desirable. . . . In church architecture the comfortable is put before the majestic, in doctrine the serviceable is preferred to the imperious, and in the conception of God the loving is not to be overshadowed by the awful. . . . Nothing is worth while except sympathy, charity, love, and their companions—trust, hope, courage, fortitude. The positive reactions are being selected because of their superior efficacy for the conditions of civilized life." Magic and religion are unlike in the main and grow steadily apart; morality and religion, independent in the beginning, draw together. and most men keep their religion because it makes them better.

Theology has tried to repudiate the categories of psychology, and Professor Leuba examines in detail the various forms that this repudiation may take. He begins with the claims made by Ritschl and other thinkers of his type: that a specific difference exists between religious knowledge and scientific or theoretical knowledge, and shows that belief in the gods of religion rests upon inductions drawn from the inner life, that religious experience belongs entirely to psychology in the same way that the rest of conscious life belongs admittedly to science, and that since the gods of religion are empirical gods—are historically to be accounted for and in experience to be known—they also belong to science. He remembers the hypothesis of the late F. W. H. Meyers that God speaks directly to the subliminal consciousness; but, of course, the subliminal consciousness comes within the field of psychology and is in no wise independent of causation, whether or not we can yet number or chart the causes which act upon it. Finally, facing theology as "a body of induced propositions," he shows that if God is conceived as the Absolute, He is inaccessible to human consciousness in a series of very neat dilemmas. The God of metaphysics is inaccessible to science, but the historical religions cannot use him: the gods of the religions are empirical beings; but their existence being evident to consciousness is within the field of science, they are really inductions from the observations of inner phenomena and are to be qualified by reference to experience like any other scientific hypothesis. Experience, however, being

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

appealed to, proves too much. "The existence of every one of the gods in whom men have ever put their faith has been held to be proved by the test of experience. Fetishes are trusted because their efficacy has been proved. Yahve showed himself to the true God by helping his worshipers to defeat the host of Chemosh. The Virgin Mary demonstrates daily her powers of intercession by serving those who address their petitions to her." Faith is a very simple and daily phenomenon by no means confined to religion, but it belongs to an incomplete state of knowledge; and theology, like science, is bound to press forward toward fuller light.

At the close the author carefully examines and analyzes the great present-day rivals of the Christian Church—Buddhism and other varieties of pantheism, including the "immanence" of Dr. Campbell, Christian Science, and other forms of mental healing, the Religion of Humanity, and Ethical Culture. He pronounces for none of them; he does not clearly forecast here the religion of the future. He seems to believe that the heart often needs such consolation and strength as religion only can give, and that it is the task of conscience to make sure that in attaining these man shall not violate those laws of sound and honest thinking which have brought him so far to such truth as he knows. Here speaks clear the intellectual integrity which is our hardest-won inheritance and our most precious. In this brief notice only a single thread of the complicated tissue could be traced, and the examination of argument and weighing of evidence was impossible. They will be most likely found adequate by those who read the book with open mind. It is planned to be the first in a series of three; the other two may be awaited without apprehension and with keen anticipation.

William Morris: A Critical Study. By John Drinkwater. New York: Mitchell Kennerley, 1912.

The monographs of which this is the seventh in the series furnish a wholesome lesson of the high advantage of literary admirations. Mr. Edward Thomas's study of Swinburne was painfully inadequate. The author was concerned almost entirely with his subject's flaws and failings. Indeed, he fell upon these so swiftly that he quite forgot how great a name he was handling lightly. Mr. Drinkwater, on the other hand, is a devout admirer of Morris and feels strongly that Morris has never yet been appreciated fully. "All men who care for the arts are pledged to refuse the false, the mean, and the vulgar at all seasons; but they do well to remain silent in the presence of things which they know to be none of these, yet find themselves unable to love. Without this love, criticism is ineffectual." It is this love, this high regard for all effort which is not false or mean or vulgar, which gives value to this critical study of Morris.

The book contains an introduction dealing with the author's theory of the function of poetry and the vocation of the poet, and Morris as the exponent of his theories. Chapter II. is an analysis and an appreciation of the early poems and prose. The third chapter deals with the interlude in Morris's life, when he married, started the firm of Morris &

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Company, Upholsterers, and devoted himself to the practical problem of creating beautiful objects to live with.

The fourth chapter deals with the return to poetry—"The Life and Death of Jason" and the "Earthly Paradise," "Love is Enough" and "Sigurd the Volsung"; the fifth, with Morris as a Socialist and a translator; the sixth, with the prose romances and poems by the way; and the conclusion is a summary of Morris's contribution to the history of English poetry.

"Poetry," the author says, "is the announcement of spiritual discovery." The discovery may not be new to the world nor even altogether new to the poet who utters it, but it is felt with the keenness and freshness, none the less, of a discovery. Verse which has beauty of form without this freshness of perception dies. The very poignancy of the emotion in poetry it is which pushes the poet to rhythmical utterance. William Morris was all his life peculiarly alive and awake to the external beauty of the world, to the joy of being alive in the world. Less than almost any other English poet was he concerned with death. Not that he questioned or sought to evade it, but that emotionally it did not appeal to him. What he felt intensely was life and beauty.

Oddly enough, the author remarks of Morris's poems that they "are never of the hothouse," and that even when he is most freely putting language to decorative uses he preserves the freshness of windy moorlands or the green stalks of lilies. He is speaking just at this point of such poems as "The Tune of the Seven Towers," "The Blue Closet," "Across the Moor," and "Two Red Roses." It is impossible to read these poems without realizing how much Maeterlinck derived from them in his own early poems which he yet deliberately called hothouse flowers—"Serres Chaudes."

Mr. Drinkwater sets Morris in the very front rank of the narrative poets beside his master, Chaucer. The former has the power of indicating clearly in the beginning what the issue is to be and yet retaining our interest throughout.

If it is the supreme merit of a volume of criticism to send us back, eager for refreshment, to the source described, then Mr. Drinkwater has attained supreme merit. He has done such brave service to Morris in so bringing to mind what is best in him that few will be satisfied without a complete re-reading of this successor to Chaucer.

EMERSON AND OTHER ESSAYS. By MAURICE MAETERLINCK. Translated by MONTROSE J. MOSES. New York: Dodd, Mead & Co., 1912.

This is no place to weigh the merits of Maeterlinck. The three essays here brought together were originally introductions to Mademoiselle Malé's Seven Essays of Emerson and Maeterlinck's translations of *Les Disciples à Saïs* and *L'Ornement des Noces Spirituelles*. Maeterlinck as a thinker will always be upon disputed ground. To the childlike heart, to the saintly, and to real philosophers he will always be one of those who have probed most deeply into the silences and secrecies of the human heart. Dr. John Dewey writes of him as one of the most sincere, loyal, and exact of thinkers. But to the bourgeois, and in particular to the dogmatically trained, the mind that labels all

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the mysteries of eternity and neatly pigeon-holes them, Maeterlinck seems superficial. He has written without taking the labels into account.

In the first six pages of the essay on Ruysbroek there are thirteen mistranslations and awkwardnesses innumerable. On the first page *puérilités* is translated "possibilities"; *tièdes* is translated "indifferent" instead of tepid; *m'a mes plus d'une fois en sueur* is mildly rendered "has troubled me more than once." "Habits and skill" are discarded in favor of "practice and qualifications." "When he speaks of his small monastic garden" the translator says, awkwardly, "He can hardly *and* sufficiently tell us what is happening." "We must clad [sic!] our inner life in red scales," says the translator, quite uninstructed that *clad* is the preterite and past participle of "clothe." *Les botanistes de l'image* emergē as "spiritual botanists." Indeed, the pages are full of mistakes, both careless and ignorant.

But why should one of the greatest stylists of France, the country where prose style comes nearest perfection, be served up by a writer ignorant of every law of his own language?—a writer who is capable of setting down such awkward sentences as, "I believe that those who have not dwelt in the intimacy of Plato and of the neo-Platonists will not proceed very far *in the perusal of this.*" "*Je ne faut pas y entres par curiosité littéraire*" is rendered, "We must not regard it *out of* literary curiosity."

The book is quite scandalously bad. The translation is so often wrong, deliberately contradicting the meaning of the author, that it misleads the reader even as to the substance of the thought; while the translator's knowledge of, and sense for, English are so lacking that one of the most exquisite of writers appears in a garb of such hideous and awkward language—even when it is not totally ungrammatical as to entirely misrepresent him.

EVERYBODY'S SAINT FRANCIS. By MAURICE F. EGAN. New York: The Century Company, 1912.

It is with some trepidation that one looks upon a new book about Saint Francis. Thomas of Celano and Saint Bonaventura have written of the loveliest of the saints exquisitely; Sabatier, from the more modern point of view, has written of him finally and exhaustively. Last year a painful and offensive biography, written from the point of view of the orthodox Romanist, by Johannes Jorgensen, appeared in an English translation. It is with a breath of relief that one closes this simple, loving, and thoroughly charming tale. Dr. Egan, though himself a devout Catholic, is liberal enough to handle Saint Francis's theology, which was, after all, only an all-embracing humanity, with understanding and fair-mindedness. He notes that Saint Francis "had no rancor against any system of government or social organization. In fact, he did not trouble himself with government or political systems; he thought only of men." This entire absorption in teaching the human soul to seek the kingdom of love, which is its natural refuge and home, Saint Francis shared with his greater prototype. It is this, indeed, and this alone, which lends his life and his words their undying charm. Unlike Christ, however, Saint Francis never glorified suffering, but always contentment and joy; and thus he serves the sick soul often as a passage to the more austere doctrine

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which teaches that he who would follow must take up his cross. What the real Franciscan student dreads each time the exquisite and rare figure is set in print again is a shock to his taste, for after all Saint Francis is at once the holiest and most exquisite of figures in the long story of the soul's development. It is no little praise to say that Dr. Egan has told the tale from end to end and never once given the reader a shudder. He tells it with a deep devotion and a delicate insight. He has no new material to offer; indeed, there is no research to be done in this case, but the life is before us once more, swiftly, simply, and beautifully told.

The pictures by Boutet de Monvel are as good as any modern pictures could be. Of course the traditional outline of Saint Francis's face, handed down to us by Giotto, Fra Angelico, and Filipino Lippo, is not to be found in these pictures, and some significance is lost thereby. For those, however, who do not bear in memory the real face of Saint Francis this simple-faced young man carrying stones to Saint Damien's and preaching to the birds will quite answer the purpose.

Rambles in the Pyrenees and the Adjacent Districts. By F. Hamilton Jackson, R.B.A. New York: E. P. Dutton & Company, 1912.

These rambles in the Spanish mountains that are not in Spain—in Gascony—the Pays de Foix and Roussillon, open up a new world of desire and form a treasury of delight. The author knows a country quite unknown to the ordinary tourist and almost neglected by the excellent Baedeker, and he knows his historical material from the latest monographs and archæological publications. So far as a hasty verification serves to show, he seems to know it well, and the book is an indispensable companion for all the enchanted land that lies more than half-way to Spain. A consequence of working from French sources probably, but one to be deplored, is the intrusion of a whole series of words not in good English use and visibly conveyed from the land of architecture and architectural study—"channelled" for fluted, "colonnette," "absidiole," "collegiale," "deambulatory," and "lapidary museum" for a place where you go to look for the débris of ruined churches and Roman inscriptions. Less easily pardoned is the use of "caps" for capitals throughout the work—an abbreviation very convenient in the note-book, but indecorous in print. While sound so far as the erudition goes, the book is frankly "popular" and deserves to be infinitely liked. It is richly illustrated; first, with some admirable half-tone plates from fine photographs by Mr. J. C. Ashton; second, with some very sensitive and exquisite pencil drawings; and, lastly, with a great number of other sketches by the author in pen and ink which are eminently satisfactory for architectural detail and picturesque scenery; and at times the very curves of the Pyrenees can trouble the heart and haunt the imagination. The bridge at Céret, the mountains above Corneilla-le-Conflent, the tower of S. Michel de Cuxa have the eternal call, the teasing *Come and find me!* which too few books of travel can convey. Special praise should be saved for the architectural work in both photographs and drawings, which is done in so admirable a manner as to have a positive value for other students of architecture.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A Miscellany of Men. By Gilbert K. Chesterton. New York: Dodd, Mead & Co., 1912.

"On the essays that follow, two comments may correctly be made: first, that they are written controversially; and, second, that they are written badly," says Mr. Chesterton in his preface, seeking to forestall the critic. On the contrary, they are written exceedingly well. We can usually count on Mr. Chesterton to take the wrong view of any subject under discussion and to take it with entertaining vivacity. In the present volume he has his usual vivacity and amusing optimism with a surprising turn for the right view of life. On the wrong side of the suffrage, Mr. Chesterton yet proves himself to be on the right side in political and economic matters; the complete fool, who has an essay to himself, is the man who cannot see that the miners in the coal strike had something on their side. The village fire inspires him with the following very sage reflections: "I remembered that there are two kinds of fires—the Bad Fire and the Good Fire; the last must surely be the meaning of Bonfire. And the paradox is that the good Fire is made of bad things, of things that we do not want; but the bad Fire is made of good things, of things that we do want." From this Mr. Chesterton draws the parallel that there are two kinds of revolution—the revolution in which bad things shall perish and the bad revolution in which good things shall perish. The essay on historic Christianity as the Divine Detective showing men their secret sins is penetrating and haunting. The essays throughout are pungent and arresting. Whatever Mr. Chesterton is, he is rarely a bore. He tires of his subject before his reader has a chance to. He says, "I would sooner call myself a journalist than an author," and the thirty-eight little essays contained in the volume are entirely journalistic in tone and handling.

Carmen Sylva. By Pierre Loti. Authorized translation by Fred Rothwell. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1912.

This dainty little blue volume contains Loti's memories of his visits to Carmen Sylva in Rumania and in Venice, some memories of Constantinople, of snake-charmers in Tetuan, some forgotten pages from "Madame Chrysanthème," and a few pages of impressions of Japanese women in 1890.

The first two sketches form a charming contrast; the first so full of romantic glamour and high security; the second showing the same lovely queen in the hour of her humiliation and distress. The fairyland of Venice in summer; the gondolas gliding out into a vast lagoon through the old quarters, with their armor-sheathed windows; the musicians playing softly as they followed in the queen's train; and, lastly, a queen herself reading aloud from her own unpublished works, are themes worthy of Loti's pen. He has touched them, too, with his wonted magic, a magic half poetry, half vague regret. His chief charm is the poignant sense in all that he writes of the evanescence of the moment. Whether he says it or not, we feel in all that he writes that he is aware, always aware, of the swift perishing of all beauty and of the poignancy in pain just because life is so short and our perception of it so incomplete. Loti is undoubtedly the French Pater.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED